

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOL. XLI No. 4 APRIL 1956

CATHOLIC STUDENTS FROM OVERSEAS

AN OPPORTUNITY AND A CHALLENGE

The General Position

IF to a single country there come from many parts of the world a great number of young men and women to study for a few years, far-reaching effects are bound to be apparent both in the students and in the countries concerned. And if most of them come from lands which are just reaching political maturity and national independence, it is obvious that the influence they will exert on their return home, as well as what happens to them in the country of their temporary sojourn, will be of the greatest importance. Such a situation exists today in England, and it is likely to affect the future of the Catholic Church in many lands.

The present position has arisen since the war. In 1939 there were in England a few hundred students from overseas. Today there are some 25,000, including those from Europe and America as well as from Africa and Asia. Some 10,000 of them are from Colonial territories, and many others from member-countries of the Commonwealth such as India and Ceylon; others, again, from Ethiopia and Thailand. The reason of this influx lies in the post-war political and industrial development of these countries: the desire for political independence where this is not yet achieved, the need to develop their natural resources—all this calls for an education greatly expanded and accelerated and for a training in technology which, at any rate for the time being, cannot be supplied at home. The numbers have increased since the war by about 500 a year and there is unlikely to be a falling-off in the foreseeable future, since it is probable that many will long continue to be attracted by the educational prestige of the West.

The background of these students differs considerably, both in nationality and in social status, ranging from substantial wealth and a rich cultural tradition to the opposite extreme of

poverty and simplicity. The subjects they study are equally varied. They attend the universities, technical colleges, training colleges, polytechnics and other centres of higher education in England, Scotland and Ireland to study every branch of learning. Nursing apart, Law, Engineering and Medicine attract the majority—and in that order.

Providing for the Needs of the Students

Responsibility for the Colonial students strictly so called was transferred in 1940 from the Crown Agents to the Colonial Office, which founded a students' department of which the director of Colonial Scholars was the head. Later, with the increase in numbers, the Colonial Office delegated to the British Council in 1950 the responsibility for the reception, accommodation and general welfare of the Colonial students. In recent years Colonial governments have begun to set up their own departments in England to look after the interests of their own students, a course which the Colonial Office has encouraged. In 1950 also, the British Council formed a standing committee of all the voluntary agencies and societies concerned with student welfare. On this committee the National Catholic Chaplain for Overseas Students represents the Catholic Church, and his presence on it constitutes his official link with the Colonial Office, the British Council and the voluntary agencies. He is thus able to get a general view of what is being done for the students; he can also make known the Catholic contribution to this general effort, and he is considerably helped by the co-operation of the committee as a whole and of individual members and the organizations they represent. While this committee is, strictly speaking, concerned with Colonial students only, many members look after all students from overseas, at least all those from Africa and Asia. The committee tends more and more to accept this fact and extend its scope accordingly.

The Catholic Contribution

There are about 4,000 Catholic students from overseas in the British Isles, of whom some 2,000 are in the London area. They come for the most part from mission lands, the intellectual cream of the mission fields and destined to be the educated

laity of their respective countries. For their own sakes it is important that they should preserve, develop and enrich their faith while they are here, and for the future of the Church in their own lands it is vital that they should return home able to take their place as Catholics in the influential spheres of life which their education will have opened up to them. This does not always happen. They tend to lose the faith in England to an extent which is disturbing. There are some now occupying high positions in their own countries who ceased to practise their religion while they were in England. This is a double tragedy, for themselves and for the Church. Our duty as Catholics, therefore, is to do everything possible to ensure that they keep and develop their faith. To this end it is necessary to understand the general difficulties that confront them as well as their specifically religious problems. Their religious difficulties cannot be treated in isolation from the whole pattern of their lives. The corporal works of mercy must accompany the spiritual.

The Difficulties of the Students

The students' difficulties often begin with their arrival here. In all probability they have long been looking forward to coming to England. They have in most cases no accurate idea of what England is really like. Their ideas have been formed from English residents at home, from films and the wireless. The result appears to be a utopian picture of a place where everything is beautiful and wonderful, where nobody does manual work and where there is no poverty or dirt. One look at London or Liverpool is enough to prick that bubble. Arriving on a sunless and—to them—very chilly, day, the student is disillusioned and depressed. Having left home amidst celebrations and farewell parties, the envy of all his friends, he reaches England to find that nobody takes much notice of him.

He is not, however, neglected. The British Council meets all Colonial students whose names have been sent to them as being either scholarship or recommended students, i.e. as having the necessary money and qualifications for the courses they intend to follow. In practice they usually find that they have to cater for more, and they do so. The students are housed at transit centres for a few days, found accommodation if they are staying

in London, or put on trains for their appropriate destinations if they are going to the provinces, where they are usually met by local representatives of the British Council. Catholics can go with the British Council staff to welcome Catholic arrivals, if it is known that any Catholics are coming. More could be done in this matter if the coming of Catholic students were known in advance, and the necessary liaison with the overseas ecclesiastical authorities and schools is gradually being effected. Generally speaking, the Catholic Overseas Chaplain learns from the Colonial Office and the Students' Units of the arrival of Catholic students only some days, occasionally some weeks, later. The chief need is for more information from overseas and for more people able and willing to meet the students, especially during the months of August, September and October, when most of them arrive. Their immediate welcoming by Catholics here is of great importance to them. The experience of the first few days and weeks is often decisive in its effect.

The students have other difficulties on the material level of which account has to be taken. They all come from hot climates and have never imagined that it could be so cold as it is here in winter. This causes them considerable hardship, especially if they are in lodgings where the heating is inadequate. Nor are most of them accustomed to our English food.

But their chief problem, as is shown in a recent enquiry undertaken by the Political and Economic Planning Committee, is that of accommodation. This is especially true of the London area. Although it is the official policy to try to place students with English families, they themselves prefer to be in hostels or halls of residence which accommodate English as well as overseas students. From the religious point of view their lodging and the sort of people they meet there can have a deep influence on the quality of their experience. The ideal would be to place every Catholic student in a suitable Catholic home. This, of course, is impossible because there are not enough such homes available. But more could be provided if the urgency of the need were recognized by the Catholic body. There are two hostels in London which can take a small number of students from overseas, and the Catholic Students' International Chaplaincy at 41 Holland Park, W.11, has accommodation for

eleven. In Manchester there is a centre with accommodation run by Father Walshe of the African Mission Society. The girl students are more easily catered for; they are considerably fewer in number and there are convents where they can stay. But the real need is for more offers of suitable accommodation in Catholic homes. A card index for this purpose is in existence and is constantly being enlarged, but it is by no means adequate to the demand.

Financial difficulties arise for the students from various causes. They sometimes find that they have underestimated the cost of living in this country, and frequently their lack of initial qualifications lengthens their course beyond their expectations and resources. Sometimes the failure of their parents or guardians to send their allowances with due regularity causes them hardship. A number of them try to solve the financial problems by working as well as studying, and indeed come with the express intention of so doing. It is not satisfactory and often proves too much of a strain. If a student makes any contact with this country before leaving home, he is discouraged from coming unless he has been accepted by some school or college, and unless he has the necessary money and qualifications for the course of study he intends to pursue.

Perhaps the greatest difficulty of these young men is psychological. However much they may suffer from the weather, the coldness of the social climate affects them more. They come from countries where the social atmosphere is very warm, where family life is very strong and where the Catholic community is very closely knit. In this country, and especially in London, they are chilled by the indifference of those around them. They do not understand how it is possible for Christians to be so uninterested in one another; that people may live next door to each other, or in the same street, or attend the same church or travel long distances together in railway carriages and yet scarcely speak—all this they find hard not only to understand but also to reconcile with the sincere practice of Christianity. This is especially the case where the local church is concerned. If when they go to Mass on Sundays they find that nobody has a word or a friendly smile for them, they feel isolated and alone in the very place where they had expected to be most at home. Such

an experience has sometimes been too much for their faith. The question is complicated by the colour bar. Officially this does not exist in England; socially, however, it does, and it is usually strongest among the less educated. Students from Africa and the East, faced with the reserve of the English social scene, cannot be expected to discern, at any rate for some time, where ordinary English coldness ends and colour prejudice begins. The need is for a more friendly approach by Catholics to these young fellow-Catholics from overseas, an approach free from condescension and based on a genuine *caritas* towards them, based also on the recognition that these young people have much to teach as well as to learn. If wherever they appeared in the Catholic churches of Great Britain they were greeted by the priest and the members of the congregation, invited into their homes and asked to take part in the social life of the parish, then much would have been done to give them that feeling that they are wanted and "belong", which would mean so much in terms of preserving and strengthening their faith. A list of Catholic families and organizations throughout the country, offering hospitality to students at Christmas and Easter and at other times, has been compiled and is in constant need of being expanded. The Chaplain for Overseas Students is willing to address any local or national English Catholic group on the subject, with a view to encouraging Catholics everywhere in England to take a greater interest in these students.

Organization

In 1951 the Hierarchy appointed the late Rt Rev. Mgr Kerr McClement as the first full-time Chaplain for the Overseas Students. He formed the Catholic Committee for Overseas Students, a working committee composed of representatives of the main Catholic national societies in England together with some individuals possessing special knowledge of the problems of the students. This body works through the organizations represented on it, each of which helps within the limits of its particular scope. The Legion of Mary is especially suited to the work as it can devote whole Praesidia to the very necessary and rewarding work of visiting the students and keeping contact with them. A sub-committee has been formed to take over the

work of running a weekly dance and other social activities at St Peter's Hall, Westminster. This had previously been done by a separate group called the Catholic Overseas Club which had been started by the Legion of Mary.

Owing to the generosity of His Eminence Cardinal Griffin, it has been possible to open at 41 Holland Park, London, W.11, the Catholic Students' International Chaplaincy. This is primarily intended for students from overseas but is not confined to them. There are rooms for meetings and socials, a chapel, a library, a lounge and small canteen. Accommodation is also available in study-bedrooms for eleven men students. These are all from different countries and include one English student and one South African. This creates at the very centre of the Catholic students' activity in London an international Catholic "family", which attracts the non-resident students and around which the Catholic effort in London can be built up. During holiday periods and the time of new arrivals, a dormitory is organized in the basement for students passing through London to the provinces or coming up from the provinces to spend a few days in London. Moreover, the Chaplaincy is open every day for the students to use as a club.

The house is staffed by the International Catholic Auxiliaries. These are a group of ladies forming a "pious confraternity", founded by Père Lebbe, a missionary in China, and first set up in Belgium. They place themselves at the disposal of bishops in missionary territories to do whatever work is required of them. They are also interested in the welfare of students from these countries studying in Europe, and so offered to conduct the domestic side of the Chaplaincy and to help the work in other ways. The presence of these Auxiliaries is proving of the greatest possible benefit to the Chaplaincy. At their hands the students are assured of a genuinely kind and considerate welcome, and without them it would be impossible to create the homely atmosphere that exists.

A number of Catholic national bodies have been, or are being, formed amongst the students. These include the Nigerian, the Gold Coast, the East African, the Far East, the Ceylon, the Indian and the West Indian Catholic Societies, and they hold their meetings and social activities at the International

Chaplaincy. They are loosely formed social groups which gather together from time to time students from the same part of the world and enable them to keep in touch with each other and with developments in the home country, thus fulfilling a need which they all have of occasionally meeting their own compatriots, and fostering a solidarity which is a great help to their self-confidence and stability. Through them, too, the Chaplain is enabled to see many whom he would otherwise not often meet. It is proposed later to hold during holiday times general meetings of these national groups, to which students from other parts of Great Britain would be invited, to discuss common problems and to determine how they can best prepare themselves to take an active part in the Catholic life of their home lands.

The International Chaplaincy works in close co-operation with the London University Chaplaincy and every effort is made to avoid in any way separating the overseas students from their English fellow-Catholics. The latter are invited to the gatherings at the International Chaplaincy and the overseas students are encouraged to join the Catholic Student Societies of their place of study. Throughout the country the Chaplains to the Universities and other institutions of higher study, the local representatives of the various national societies, and many individuals, do everything possible to integrate the students from overseas into English Catholic life while they are in this country.

Such in brief outline is the organization. But it only partially fulfils its purpose. What is really required is that the Catholic body as a whole should appreciate the implications of the presence amongst them of so many students from such a variety of lands. Their presence here is an opportunity and a challenge. It is an opportunity, by the quality and depth of our own Catholicism, to influence decisively and at a formative period in their lives the future educated laity of many lands. It is a challenge to the sincerity of our belief in the universality of the Church.

JOHN COONAN

CONFIRMATION AT ELEVEN-PLUS?

A VIEW FROM IRELAND

I AM very much interested in the Bishop of Brentwood's¹ suggestion in the October 1955 *THE CLERGY REVIEW* that Confirmation in England might be usefully deferred until the age of eleven. The matter is taken up in that indefatigable educational review from Birmingham, *The Sower*, January 1956. The editor, commenting on the Bishop's observation that "the transition from primary to secondary school marks a real stage in a child's growing up", points out that "the sacrament of Confirmation might reasonably be expected to stand out as a sort of landmark in the school career of a Catholic child". "The Church," the editor continues, "nowadays defers Confirmation till the use of reason; the Council of Trent Catechism suggests the age of twelve years; but we are often giving it at the dawn of reason." This editorial is a reprint of what appeared in a very early issue of *The Sower* in 1919. I take it that Confirmation at the age of reason is now the established method in England.

I do not think it quite accurate to say that the Catechism of Trent suggests the age of twelve as the age for the sacrament. The Catechism suggests rather that the sacrament might be deferred to the age of twelve where the circumstances warrant it. The real point seems to be that the age of reason is the proper age, by comparison with the early Church discipline. There seems to be little doubt at this stage of canonist disputation over Canon 788 that early Confirmation is in fact the law. In so far, therefore, as the mind of the Church is to be sought in the expression of her laws—and this seems a very reasonable proceeding—the mind of the Church is that we should confirm our children, in the ordinary course of events, when they have reached the use of reason.

Nevertheless we are faced with the actual situation that the law is not enforced. Confirmation at the dawn of adolescence is a very common thing, and in my country is the usual thing. Apart from a few dioceses where Confirmation is administered

¹ Now Bishop of Salford.

at the canonical age, ten or eleven plus is the age for reception. Quite a number of our children are thirteen or fourteen when they are confirmed.

The late Confirmation age is a long-standing tradition with us. The post-Emancipation Church has grown up on it. In our schools the "Confirmation class" has always been regarded as a kind of graduation stage in religious instruction. The confirmed child has arrived: he has entered into the state of religious manhood. It can be a very moving experience to watch a bishop, especially in a rural church, testing the children in a public examination before conferring the sacrament. The adults are intensely interested. You will observe an old man leaning forward to catch the answers. The ceremony, from this point of view at least, does have a profound effect not only on the young confirmandi but on the whole parish. I think everyone feels, to quote Bishop Beck's words, that these youngsters are "entering into a privileged group and acquiring special status in the Church".

I am afraid, however, that the real interest of the Irish Church in circumventing the New Code as long as possible, if that is not too strong a way to put it, is more concerned with catechetical discipline than with religious psychology. Indeed the same appears to be true outside Ireland, in fact wherever the late age for Confirmation continues to be the rule. With us, at any rate, it is strongly held that if children receive their Confirmation early they will not work hard at their catechism afterwards. Confirmation is set before them as an aim and a stimulus. In the past the thing was often overdone. The examination was a very stiff affair. Children would be turned down, and some failing to make the grade might never be confirmed. In one diocese at least, and up to fairly recently, the confirmandi were given different coloured tickets in accordance with their prowess during the test. Decked out with these they were paraded in public, rather like exhibits in a Show. A few years ago a prelate addressing a group of Diocesan Inspectors referred to the traditional class-room furore before the coming of the bishop and deplored what he called "this Confirmation hysteria". There is a great easing off nowadays, but at the same time the essential system holds good and in nearly every diocese

the children are examined in the unusual atmosphere of the church by the bishop himself. Confirmation continues to be an event. It certainly stands out "as a sort of landmark in the school career of a Catholic child". And even though it is the catechism struggle that impresses more than the liturgical ceremony (we are not very liturgy-conscious in Ireland), still the impression is made. Teachers tell us that under-privileged children whom the Civic Guards and others have to chase to school will come willingly even for extra classes at Confirmation time. This is a powerful argument in support of the traditional method, because we in Ireland remain convinced that no educational effort is worth while that does not involve a great labour on the part of those who learn.

So powerful an argument is it that it may well begin to have its appeal to the English Church if Confirmation were deferred to the end of the primary school period. The Confirmation test, and I dare say there would be a test, might begin to bulk large in the system of religious instruction. The primary schools might easily find themselves up against another hurdle analogous to the one they face with such diffidence when preparing their pupils for Grammar Schools. Some further reflexion, therefore, on the system of late Confirmation as it works in Ireland may be useful in this "time for constructive suggestions".

I should say that I speak for myself and for an inconsiderable minority in the Irish Church when I venture to express doubts about the value of late Confirmation on catechetical grounds. In our system the Confirmation catechesis tends to overshadow, especially in rural schools, the whole scheme of religious instruction. Confirmation is administered on the occasion of the bishop's triennial Visitation. To meet this the custom is to form a "Confirmation class" of those about to be presented independent of the grade in which the children are actually studying. This class is usually formed during the year preceding the episcopal visit which takes place in the early summer. In schools of very special zeal, or perhaps of very special reputation, the Confirmation class is formed directly after the bishop's departure, to prepare for the next round, so that the class is always in session. The result is that in small schools of two or three teachers,

and 75 per cent of our schools are like that, one catechist's time is regularly taken up with preparation for a Confirmation test, more or less exacting. The graded syllabus, if it exists—and it usually does—is neglected, while the children who are already confirmed are given to twiddling their thumbs. For these latter there is the added psychological effect of their having "graduated" and of having nothing more to learn.

Even in the larger schools there is a marked tendency to give the "Confirmation class", generally the ten- or eleven-year-olds (in what we call the Fourth or Fifth Standard), a special rank and importance. This is very good in itself if it did not tend to deflate the other classes, especially those already over the stile. And there is another point, and I think it is the general experience or at least the general tendency. Confirmation is such an event in Irish catechesis that the bishop's visit is inclined to overshadow the visit of every other functionary, even a Diocesan Inspector. The Diocesan Inspector's examination which is a graded yearly affair, and the real ultimate test of progress, if he does his work well and the system is fairly conceived, can come to be regarded as an affair of less import. Indeed the Inspector himself loses in status seeing that it is the bishop's visit and test that is the real issue in the eyes of the catechists. I am speaking, of course, of catechetical status.

I would not wish to exaggerate the difficulties. In my own long experience as a Diocesan Inspector I have found that the clash between the Confirmation programme and the regular syllabus can be counteracted to a large extent by a carefully graded syllabus, stressed and insisted upon, willy-nilly, Confirmation or no Confirmation. And I am aware that some of the difficulties we meet could not develop in the English primary schools. There are in England relatively few small schools, and the "Confirmation class" would always be the upper standard in the large school if the age for Confirmation were deferred. I am assuming, also, that there would be a test, a more or less stiff test, and that it would be conducted by the bishop or some lesser dignitary. All or none of these things may happen. On the other hand, they may. One never really knows. At any rate, the pre-eminence of a Confirmation test, especially as conducted by one who may lack the training and even the instincts of a

schoolmaster, is disturbing to a progressive system of religious instruction which, however, we may argue about it, is based on the class-room. It is easy enough to begin the examination of an eleven-year-old's knowledge of the faith. The trouble is to know where to stop, where to get off. The rationalist lines of the old catechesis are best suited to "extern examiners" and when they are due it is wiser to prepare accordingly. What, then, of the *kerygmatic* approach to religious teaching, "the tremendous devotion to Christ, our Lord, with an awareness of Him" which Frank Sheed speaks of and the Bishop applauds? Catechists are groping more and more towards this ideal, without being unaware of how evasive it can be.

So much for Confirmation as it fits into the system of catechetics. There remains the argument advanced by the editor of *The Sower*, supported apparently by the Bishop's plea. It is an argument from psychology, claiming that the age of eleven or twelve is a critical age in the life of a human being, at least in the life of a school-going being, and that Confirmation responds to this crisis "with its special graces and imaginative appeal". This is a most interesting argument in that it is precisely on these grounds, at least to the extent of the need for special graces to meet a crisis in the life struggle, that contemporary writers demand an early Confirmation. The Belgian catechist, Father Delcuve, S.J., calls to his aid a distinguished array of child psychologists to support his pleadings for Confirmation at the age of reason.¹ One of these is quoted as speaking of "the hard battle" children in the seven to twelve year group must "wage for the conquest of their moral life". Father Delcuve goes so far as to suggest an argument from child psychology for a return to the primitive discipline of the Church, still obtaining in Spain, where Confirmation is conferred soon after baptism. Apart from the experts at all, it would seem comparatively easy to build up a case in this age for an early visit from the Holy Ghost on grounds of special need.

As for the "imaginative appeal", it is hardly possible to justify deferment of the sacrament until the age of eleven or twelve on this ground alone; although I often meet children of

¹ *A Necessity for the Normal Efficacy of Religious Education: Confirmation at the Age of Reason. Lumen Vitae. V, 2-3.*

this age who are profoundly moved by the whole experience of Confirmation, the effort and sacrifice of preparation, and the crowning reward of reception. It is quite evident to one observing them that they have had a great spiritual experience, that it will live in their memories and that it is for their great good. But we cannot write off Confirmation as a memory, however sweet and compelling to virtue, no more than we can treat it as a discipline in catechism. Confirmation is a force within, aiding the development of the Christian personality, never so necessary as in the years of our formation. Surely it is this "discovery" of the sacrament in modern times by theologians and religious psychologists that is moving us towards early reception more than the pressure of the law.

Perhaps the liturgy of the restored Easter Vigil with its beautiful ceremony of renewal of the Baptismal Vows may supply the appeal to the religious imagination of young Christians. Maybe it is by experimenting with the new liturgy rather than by risking Confirmation that England will find the solution of those educational problems so ably posed by Dr Beck.

MICHAEL TYNAN

DIALOGUE MASS: SOME PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

THE authoritative article by Father O'Connell on Dialogue Mass (*THE CLERGY REVIEW*, October 1954, XXXIX) and the increasing benevolence—even encouragement—of several members of our Hierarchy towards this practice have brought a welcome increase in the opportunities given to the faithful for active participation in the liturgy. Yet at times one hears, both in conversation and by letter, of instances where an attempt to introduce the Dialogue Mass in some parish has been a failure. A priest has decided to try it, only to find that "it does not work". But in each case, when there is opportunity to put a few questions, it comes to light that the failure can be explained by the fact that the priest has approached this new venture with

good will indeed, but without any knowledge of sundry practical aspects of the task; and it is because he had not taken into account these practical points (which had never even occurred to him) that his well-meant effort met with failure. Discussion (and in some cases demonstration) has enabled him to try again with complete success.

It is because I have had very considerable experience in running Dialogue Mass, and that in many different places, that I venture here to offer some hints which may prove useful to fellow-priests who have conceived the desire and obtained permission to introduce Dialogue Mass amongst their people. If they will really follow these hints they need have no fear of failure.

When I first took to running Dialogue Masses I used to aim at getting the people to answer all the Low Mass responses with the server, and to join in the *Gloria*, *Credo*, *Sanctus* and *Agnus Dei*. But for several years past I have come round to the view common among liturgists on the Continent, namely, that Dialogue Mass should be regarded (and treated) as a Sung Mass without music. That means that the people should say all, *but only*, those parts which they would sing at a Sung Mass.

From the Low Mass responses there would thus be left to the server alone all the prayers at the foot of the altar, the answers *Deo gratias* and *Laus tibi Christe* at the end of the scripture readings, the *Suscipiat*, and the responses before and after the Last Gospel. There are suasive reasons for this view based on liturgical history: the authentic form for Public Mass is the Sung Mass, while Low Mass is actually the form for Private Mass (even though it is now constantly used in public). The argument would run, then, that if it be desired to celebrate Mass in a manner which is professedly public (as is the case with Dialogue Mass) one should adopt the public form, even if the music of it be left out. (It remains true, of course, that to use the Low Mass form in its entirety is also justifiable.)

The chief reasons, however, are practical. In this plan all the difficulties are cut out. It is notorious that the people find the *Judica* psalm the hardest part to learn; the *Suscipiat* is to them a severe tongue-twister; and only a well-drilled and experienced congregation ever succeeds in saying the *Deo gratias*

and *Laus tibi Christe* in a prompt and united manner at the end of the Epistle and Gospel respectively. Most congregations make a complete mess of both, for they have no definitely recognizable cue for these responses. (If they are following the English translation in their missals they will not observe the priest remove his hand from the book or kiss the book.) Nor is there anything to tell them precisely when to start the *Suscipiat*, since there ought to be a pause (for *ut meum ac vestrum sacrificium*, etc.) after the celebrant's *Orate fratres*.

It is impossible to use the full Low Mass form without having a lot of practice beforehand; and most of the time and effort expended in this practice will be taken up with teaching the prayers at the foot of the altar. This will seem to invest them with an importance which is quite disproportionate since they are, in fact, only a preparation for Mass. Till comparatively recent times they were not done in public at all, and it may well be that they will be relegated to the sacristy again (or abolished) in the reforms expected not long hence. The *Suscipiat* also takes time to learn; yet historically it was never said by the people until the invention of Dialogue Mass. The *Orate fratres* is officially addressed by the priest to those about the altar (the *circumstantes* of the *Ritus Servandus*, VII, 7), i.e. the sacred ministers and altar staff. This is indicated by the fact that the celebrant is directed to say these two words *voce aliquantulum elata* (*ibid.*) and not, therefore, in a voice such that it will be heard right down the church. Now if the prayers at the foot of the altar and the *Suscipiat* are not going to be said by the people at a Dialogue Mass there is no need to practice them. Thereby much trouble is saved.

I would urge, therefore, as the first practical hint, that the form chosen for Dialogue Mass should be the High Mass responses, not the Low Mass responses. The people can be told: "You answer nothing before the *Kyrie*; nothing after the Blessing; and leave the *Suscipiat* to the server." That makes things very easy.

The next practical hint seems so obvious that it would not be worth mentioning but for the undoubted fact that, *incredibile dictu*, some priests have neglected it. It is merely to ensure that everybody has a book with the texts they need to use. Unless

all the people have the words of the *Gloria*, *Credo*, *Sanctus* and *Agnus Dei* it is hopeless to expect them to join in with these, even if they might make some sort of attempt at the rest. At the time of writing, the Society of St Gregory is about to publish a Mass-booklet designed for use both at Dialogue Mass and at Sung Mass. When it comes out it is likely to be very satisfactory. A cheaper and thoroughly practical alternative would be to issue to the people those 2½d. Dialogue Mass booklets published by Geo. Coldwell of 17 Red Lion Square, W.C. These indeed contain the full Low Mass form, but everything is numbered, with the people's parts in heavy print. It is thus easy enough to tell them: "Answer only Nos. 16 to 33, leaving out 24", and there will be no trouble.

The third practical hint is never to attempt Dialogue Mass without preparing the people for it by some instruction concerning the social nature of the Mass. They must be enabled to see the reasons why they should answer; otherwise they will have no desire to answer, and their collaboration will be lacking. At least, therefore, this one feature of the Mass liturgy—that it is *designed* for social use—must be made clear to them. How easy it is to make them understand (for example) that when the priest says *Dominus vobiscum* he is greeting all of them, and not merely the server. Hence that all of them, not merely the server, should greet him in return. Or that when he says the Collect he is praying as spokesman of them all, not as spokesman for one small boy; hence it is reasonable that all, and not just one small boy, should express their assent in the *Amen*.

It is far better, of course, to give the people a series of Mass instructions on a number of consecutive Sundays before the attempt at Dialogue Mass. Excellent material can be derived for these from the five-shilling booklet by Père Chéry, O.P., entitled *What is the Mass?* (Blackfriars Publications, 34 Bloomsbury Street). In any case the priest should immerse himself in this (or some similar) book, even if he lacks opportunity to pass on its contents to his people. The one instruction about the social nature of the liturgy is, however, an irreducible minimum.

Father O'Connell points out in his article that "if the Dialogue Mass is to be successfully introduced, it is obvious that the celebrant of the Mass must speak distinctly and in a

tone that can easily be heard, and that his celebration of the Mass must be unhurried". This is really the hub of the whole problem; and more cases of failure are attributable to neglect of this than to any other cause. For though indeed "it is obvious", the fact remains that some priests do not realize its implications. It means that without a radical change of their *mental attitude* when celebrating it is quite impossible for them ever to achieve the successful introduction of Dialogue Mass. For their manner of celebrating is but the externalization of their mental attitude; and this manner is often such that it will unfailingly wreck any attempt, even by willing people, to respond or to join in.

If a priest has never done a Dialogue Mass before it means that throughout all his priestly life he has never had to pay any practical attention to anybody but his server. He is likely thus to have become utterly accustomed to a certain rhythm of utterance. He says, for example, *Kyrie eleison, Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison, Kyrie eleison, Kyrie eleison*—and says it more or less *like that*. He does not (even though perhaps he should) consciously *listen* to his server who, with the alacrity of the average keen altar-boy, contrives from experience to insert his own *Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison, Christe eleison, Kyrie eleison* into the interstices! But when a priest has a congregation answering it is absolutely vital that he *consciously listen to them*. He must positively be aware that he has heard them completely finish saying their first *eleison* (including its last syllable) before he begins his second *Kyrie*, and so on. He is accustomed, before the Collect, to say *Dominus vobiscum. Oremus*. And the zealous boy will have been so quick off the mark with his *Et cum spiritu tuo* that he will have fitted it in (more or less) successfully. Not so with a congregation. What they need is that the priest must have the (to him) unwonted attitude of realizing that he is addressing *all* of them, including the somewhat deaf old woman in the back bench. (If there is no such deaf old woman he should imagine one!) He must deliberately will to make *her* realize that he is *talking to her* (not just uttering a sound merely because it is printed in the Missal). He must do this in a tone of voice calculated to elicit a response *from her*. He must then consciously listen to make sure that he has clearly heard her (and all the others) finish the pronunciation of the word *tuo* before he pro-

ceeds to say the word *Oremus* (which word he should likewise realize that he is addressing to her). And so with all the other responses.

A particular pitfall comes just before the Gospel. Normally the priest goes towards the book and says *Dominus vobiscum*. At a Dialogue Mass this will not do. He has to think of the people. When he walks towards the book they may or may not begin to stand up; probably they will do so only when he has arrived at the book, and it will take them about three seconds to do so. If he says *Dominus vobiscum* during the noise they make while getting to their feet they will not hear him and will miss their response. But if he will wait until they have stood, create an atmosphere of expectancy by a further slight pause and then (only then!) say *Dominus vobiscum* in what one might term "a provocative tone of voice", he will certainly get a satisfactory answer.

This same mental attitude of conscious attention to the people is needed even more imperatively when it comes to the point of their joining in with, say, the *Gloria*. The priest's normal rhythm of utterance will completely defeat them. What he has to do is to stop after the word *Deo*, and then say, syllable by syllable, with emphasis on each syllable, *et in ter-ra pax . . .* slowly and deliberately until he can feel that the people have "caught on". Once they are with him (but not before) he can increase his speed, and they will keep with him provided he is loud enough. But in order to get them with him in the first instance he has to use this technique of exaggerating the loudness and slowness of the first few syllables. The inertia of the people has to be overcome by his positively exercised leadership. It is just the same with the *Credo*, *Sanctus* and *Agnus Dei*. Once the people move, they move along well. But they have to be started into motion with extreme care and attention.

All this is but the practical detailed working out of the principle laid down by Father O'Connell in a previous paragraph of his article: "The priest presides over the entire function; the people pray and offer with him and through him, in entire dependance on him." That is the point which the celebrant has to realize—the *people depend on him*. He is the leader who must take them with him, not the runner who must out-distance

competitors. He is the watchful shepherd, ever mindful of his flock, who must suit his pace to their pace—not a solitary walker who chooses his pace to suit himself alone.

It is worth reflecting that at a Public Mass the priest has two functions to fulfil: he is to preside, and also to celebrate. In the early days of the Church there was no such thing as a Private Mass in our sense of a priest and server with no congregation at all. Always there were some people, even though only a small private group such as a family at a grave-side. The priest then always did actually preside as well as celebrate. In fact he was known as the *ἐπίσκοπος* or the *πρεσβύτερος* (as the case might be) and never as the *ἀρχιερεύς* or the *ἱερέύς*. These latter names and others of a similar meaning were, until the end of the second century, never used except as applied primarily to Christ Himself and secondarily to the faithful as a whole.¹ They were never applied to the one who presided and celebrated, which shows that of his two functions it was that of presiding that received the emphasis.

But with the introduction of Private Mass in our sense (i.e. priest with server alone) there was no community over whom to preside. And as private Masses became far more numerous than Public Masses the function of presiding receded into the background of the clerical mind. The sacerdotal (celebrating) function not only came thus into the foreground (because the priest was only celebrating and not presiding) but even seems to have taken exclusive possession. The use in public (as at Low Mass) of the Private Mass form has done nothing to redress the balance. That may account for the fact that so many priests seem to go to the altar with the sacerdotal rather than the presidential mind. They are fully conscious that they are celebrating, and oblivious of the fact that they should be presiding. It is vitally necessary that any priest who is to be celebrant at a Dialogue Mass should be imbued with the latter conviction also. Without it he will wreck the celebration.

Though it is not absolutely necessary, it is extremely useful to have some leadership for the people in the form of another priest in the pulpit, or else a layman or group of laymen who will speak out the answers confidently in a loud voice. Such a

¹ von Dunin Borkowski, *Die Kirche als Stiftung Jesu*, Vol. II, pp. 55 sqq.

group is more effective when employed from behind the people. Practice for the entire congregation can be reduced to a minimum; it is sufficient (provided they have been given the reasons for social celebration and also texts to make this possible) to have a mere three-minute practice consisting only of the *Kyrie*, a few sentences of the *Gloria* (that they may learn how to join on to the celebrant's opening words) and the Preface responses. If they can do that much properly, they can do everything.

CLIFFORD HOWELL, S.J.

“HERE ARE TWO SWORDS”

IN this lively little book,¹ the substance of lectures delivered at the Newman Summer Sessions of 1953, Father Paul Foster offers his personal commentary on the vast problem. He does so without having to enter into wide-ranging discussion of the largest elements of the question, Natural and International Law, “the Two Swords”, the theory of Indirect Power, and the latent possibilities of conflict between the State that is solely concerned with secular and material ends and the Church which is implicitly and explicitly committed to the task of extending the reign of Christ our Lord over the whole of human life. Nor could anyone, in just over 100 crown octavo pages, handle the vast mass of factual material accumulated in every century of our era. As the author explains in his Introduction, the lectures follow an arbitrary scheme and do not propound a specific solution; he nevertheless contrives to be as suggestive as writers who have produced more elaborate and academic treatises.

In ten chapters the writer ranges from The Cities of Aristotle, Augustus and Augustine, the *Civitas Dei*, through the Middle Ages, the Reformation, and modern times, till he comes to what he calls Materialist Caesaropapism, surely the *Civitas Impiorum*. The concluding chapter is an elevated discourse, “Man at His

¹ *Two Cities: A Study of the Church-State Conflict*. By Paul Foster, O.P. Blackfriars Publications, London, 6s, 6d.

Full Stature", based upon Ephesians iv, 12-14 (Knox). The fullest treatment here is that of the all-important rôle of the Catholic Bishop in the Dark Ages as the continuator of the civilization not altogether submerged with the Roman Empire—in a striking phrase, as "the grandfather of the barbarians". Next come sections on Byzantine Caesaropapism, the Holy Roman Empire, St Thomas Aquinas and the State, Boniface VIII and Marsiglio of Padua, the Reformation with Valois, Hapsburgs and Bourbons, and elsewhere "the godly Prince" who was nearly always a heretic.

The opening paragraph of Chapter I strikes a strong and clear note: "There is no parallel to the scenes between Ambrose and Theodosius, Hildebrand and Henry IV, Becket and Henry II, Thomas More and Henry VIII, Pius VII and Napoleon, Pius XI and Mussolini, Stepinac and Tito," but there is here a suggestion of factual treatment that could not be maintained in a volume of manageable size. Necessarily we are reminded that the sphere of these collisions is to be found only in Europe; in a Khalifate or in China no such conflicts could arise. As early as possible in the existence of Christianity the inevitable duality made its appearance. In Acts i the Church is already "perfect", with a perfection exclusive of the surrounding secular and idolatrous world, and does not take long about coming into collision with it. "Render unto Caesar . . ." is here described as an epigram used by our Lord to baffle those who tried to entrap him. It has baffled a good many people since, for it implies that there is a sphere specially reserved for the State, and that there is therefore a frontier. So, too, with the quip "An two men sit on a horse, one of them must ride behind"—but is it always on the same horse? Father Foster's observations on *The City of God* inevitably bring up the famous quotation "If Justice is taken away, what are Kingdoms but great robberies" and he makes the shrewd remark: "many great books are important for what they are thought to be rather than for what they are".

With the exception of Chapter V (St Thomas Aquinas) the most distinctive portion of the book is the account of Sidonius Apollinaris, Gallo-Roman bishop, *defensor civitatis*, and "politician to the barbarians" (*ducem et praeceptorem gentibus*), whose

task it was to prevent society slipping down into chaos. Here we have historical truth enforced in the homely phrases of nursery rhyme, that what all the king's horses and all the king's men could not put together again had to be restored (as far as might be) and maintained by the patient work of the Catholic bishops. “The Roman city was not a *polis*, but a camp” is another very true remark and that is why it had so little to transmit in the way of political organization after the breakdown. So it came to pass that the French Monarchy with its immense potentiality for Western civilization was the creation of the bishops.

The chapter on Byzantine Caesaropapism would have had to be a long one to deal with the wide and deep chasm created by the train of events between the Popes and the Eastern Emperors. Before the end of the sixth century the Pope had been forced into the position of a temporal prince in the City and the Duchy. During the period of collapse he was the only person who could keep order, could relieve distress, or ransom captives. He was the universal legatee of the patrician families who were dying out and had nobody to whom they could leave their lands. The absolute failure of the Greek emperors to preserve Italy from the barbarians had more to do with the matter than their comparative failure to preserve orthodoxy. Father Foster in an interesting page points out that they were nearly all Monophysites or Monothelites at heart and so fell at last into the open heresy of Iconoclasm. But notwithstanding this deep cause of estrangement it would seem that it was the political vacuum that decisively altered the position of the Pope; otherwise, he would surely have remained Patriarch of the West without becoming a Prince. If there had been a king—somebody like Theodoric—at Rome, or even a Byzantine Exarch, the whole story would have been very different. Later on, the Crusades and the papal alliance with the Normans and Angevins in Southern Italy precluded the long-desired reunion of Latins and Greeks.

With the judgement that “the Holy Roman Empire could no more have been expanded into a world-government than Gothic Architecture or the Feudal System could have accommodated the constructional and economic needs of modern

times", everyone will agree. Apart from the fact that the "Feudal System" never was a system, the general condition of central Europe, with a more or less barbarian King surrounded by military chieftains, each of whom headed a tribal organization capable of opposing the monarch, kept the lay State in a position of marked inferiority to the Church which not only had the Roman tradition of universalism and international order but also possessed the organs and exercised the functions of a complete State. Under the great line of canonist Popes, it possessed legislative power, its own law-courts and judges, appellate jurisdiction in a supreme tribunal, and a bureaucracy in the permanent officials of the papal chancery. The Kingdom not of this world was thus far more highly organized and efficient and long before it was put into a commanding position by the genius of Innocent III it was too strong for Henry II of England and Frederick Barbarossa.

Complications had ensued because the Church had become involved in feudalism through two serious menaces to a Christian society, simony and clerical marriage. Even without those perils the necessities of the times brought about the appointment of bishops who possessed far more military and political ability than spiritual efficacy. Hence the vast dioceses of Germany, north-eastern France, and, for that matter, England; hence, palatines, Prince-Bishops and that singular anomaly, the three Ecclesiastical Electors.

At this point we reach the interesting chapter on St Thomas Aquinas and the State. It is admittedly theoretical, for before St Thomas had written anything the Papal Monarchy had been impressively developed, the adverse power of the Hohenstaufen Emperors had been dislocated, and except in France, the Roman Pontiff was almost everywhere arbiter and overlord. Boniface VIII came at the end of a line of Popes who had held so great a position that it would have required someone far more perceptive, far less subject to the impulses of his own nature, to realize that he was confronted by a formidable and ruthless opponent. French nationalism and incipient Gallicanism were thus marshalled behind an able and unscrupulous king. Philippe le Bel was served, too, by a group of regalist and Ghibelline lawyers whose mentality was as secularist and materialist as

that of Thomas Cromwell. “*Your power is words*,” said Pierre Du Bois to Boniface, “my master’s is real!”

Of Marsiglio of Padua there is really nothing new to be said. Father Foster remarks that his theory, which was destructive of the whole position and claim of the Church, was curiously not advanced in favour of the then great political reality, France, but in favour of the decaying Holy Roman Empire. That again was due to a simple, factual cause, he and Ockham and Jandun happened to be all three of them in the service of Lewis the Bavarian. It was then that the war of words was at its height, metaphor against metaphor, text against text. *Regnum meum non est de hoc mundo* was met by *Constitutes eos principes super omnem terram*, and much more. Avignon finance accentuated the disputes. Eventually Clement VI was told by Edward III that he was commissioned to feed the sheep, not to fleece them. Father Foster justly remarks that as a result of all these contentions a very practical danger emerged: “If the Church is to rule states directly, it is all too easy for a churchman involved in politics to say: ‘Catholicism is true; I am a Catholic; therefore all I do as a statesman is just’. This can be seen in the career of Savonarola, when at his instance, the city of Florence declared Christ to be its King.” But extreme propositions could lead to worse things than the aberrations of Savonarola; they had long since led to the Inquisition. What has been aptly called “ultra supernaturalism” induces in its addicts first of all the belief, and then the practical conviction, that they have the right to do almost anything in the interests of Religion.

In the chapter entitled “The Papacy and Progress” we naturally hear something about *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno* but earlier passages in that chapter do not appear to enhance its value. It is pointed out that after the French Revolution the idea of Progress had taken root and is still affecting European political life. Then we are told that: “the greatest and most outspoken enemy of the idea of Progress was the Catholic Church led by the Papacy. This was not, as is so often surmised, because the Church is an autocratic institution or because of its one-time fondness for the *Ancien Régime*. It is because the idea of Progress contradicts the fact of Original Sin

with its consequence in the tendency of men to do evil unless divine Grace guides them". But is not this reading too much into the term, Progress, and confusing it with the Eighteenth-Century doctrine of Perfectibility? In the ordinary loose sense of the term—the sense employed by secular governments in the early nineteenth century—Progress meant the improvement of things in general and there was nothing inadmissible in that. Father Foster then adds that there was undoubtedly in the minds of some Churchmen, as in the minds of some statesmen, a tendency to confuse the Doctrine of Progress with the facts of mechanical and industrial progress, and he mentions Gregory XVI. That pontiff is the most disastrous example of such confusion. There is no question about his fondness for the *Ancien Régime* and his fixed belief that it was good enough for all Italians of whatsoever degree between Ravenna and Terracina, and thus it is a little difficult to see what is gained by bringing him and his administration into the argument.

Chapter IX, "Materialist Caesarpapism", demonstrates that Marxism is both a philosophy and a religion and amid much that is admirable contains the striking aphorism that Communism affords a vivid temptation to the Cain in each of us. The general reader, for whom this brilliant little book is said to be intended, will do well to acquire it and study it.

J. J. DWYER

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

HOLY SCRIPTURE

IT is, once again, a pleasure to mention some additions to the already large number of periodicals that cater for the student of Holy Scripture. The first of those received is not quite so new as the others, since the review has been in existence for more than a year. It is the first number of Volume II of *New Testament Studies*, which is an international journal published quarterly under the auspices of "Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas", and is dated September of last year. As usual, the contributions are divided between articles, short studies and

reviews. Of the three articles far the most important is the survey by Professor B. M. Metzger of Princeton of the ancient versions of the New Testament. He carries out, on a smaller scale in the matter of length, but for a far larger number of languages, the sort of investigation made familiar by that useful work, now in a second and enlarged edition, *Ancient and English Versions of the Bible*.¹ Metzger, in some sixteen pages, gives up-to-date information about ten languages in all, namely, Latin, Syriac, Coptic, Gothic, Armenian, Old Georgian, Ethiopic, Arabic, Sogdian, and Old Slavic. Rev. L. Morris writes on the meaning of *hilasterion* in Romans iii, 25, arguing that the meaning is not "mercy-seat", but something like "means of propitiation", which would closely correspond to Lagrange's "instrument de propitiation expiatoire".² Among the reviews is a long study by W. D. Davies (the author of *St. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*) of Professor J. Munck's recent *Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte* (Copenhagen, 1954).

The first number of the *Journal of Semitic Studies*, edited by Professor H. H. Rowley and Dr P. R. Weis, is full of rich promise for the journal's future. Of the three main articles two are of special interest to Old Testament studies, namely, Professor K. Koehler's "Problems in the Study of the Language of the Old Testament", which is reminiscent of the late Professor Kennett's famous essay in *The Church of Israel*, and Professor Otto Eissfeldt's "El and Yahweh". The third article by J. Robson on the textual transmission of the Arabic writer Nasâ'i's *Sunan* can be of service only to a small group of experts in the language of the Qur'ân. The reviews occupy some thirty pages, and cover a wide variety of literature. Perhaps the most notable is Professor M. Black's appreciation of G. R. Driver's *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century, B.C.*, and of E. G. Kraeling's edition of the Brooklyn papyri. The journal costs 32s. a year (single copies 10s. each) and may be ordered through any bookseller.

Lastly, a word about the first issue of *New Testament Abstracts* edited by Father W. A. Abbott, S.J., of Weston College, Massachusetts. This is an unpretentious affair, produced in the form

¹ Oxford Press, 1954, with an appendix on the Dead Sea Scrolls by Professor W. D. McHardy.

² Cf. *Épître aux Romains*, Paris, 1950, pp. 75 ff.

of duplicated typescript that helps to reduce the cost of multiplying copies. Within the compass of forty closely typed sheets, the compilers manage to give notices of some eighty or so books and articles that range over the whole field of New Testament studies. They are to be congratulated on wide reading and clear and concise reviewing. The little periodical costs only 35 cents a copy, and should prove extremely valuable.

To anybody who has had the experience of collecting, at some trouble and expense, a small shelf-ful of Talmudic studies, it will be extremely welcome news that Père Joseph Bonsirven, S.J., who is certainly our greatest authority on rabbinical literature, has recently given to the world a series of *Textes Rabbiniques des deux premiers siècles chrétiens pour servir à l'intelligence du N.T.*¹ This is intended to supplement his two volumes on *Le Judaïsme palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ, sa théologie*, published in 1935, recognized at once as indispensable for all serious students, and now, alas, out-of-print.² This large work must not be confused with the abridgement under the same title which appeared in 1950 or with an earlier volume *Les idées juives au temps de Notre-Seigneur*, published by Bloud & Gay in 1934. At the time when Père Bonsirven produced the two volumes of his greatest work there was only one serious complaint to be made, namely, that he could not give *in extenso* the texts on which the book was based. The most that could be done was to supply copious references, and, at times, to quote a word or a significant phrase to illustrate the teaching of the rabbis. Here, at last, in this volume of texts, we have something like a counterpart to Strack and Billerbeck's great *Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud u. Midrasch*, though the arrangement is not according to the New Testament order, but is one that follows the order of the Mishnaic tractates.

In this country we have had, since 1932, the advantage of possessing the late Professor Danby's excellent translation of the Mishnah. Unlike Bonsirven's works this gives all the tractates in their entirety but, by way of compensation, Bonsirven supplies large extracts from the Tosephta (i.e. the "addition" or

¹ Pont. Istituto Biblico, Rome, 1955. Pp. xii + 804. Price 4500 lire (or 7.50 dollars).

² Cfr. THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1935, Vol. X, pp. 388-89. Also the Soc. for O.T. Study's Book List for 1951, p. 69.

"supplement" to the Mishnah, a collection of Halakôth or received rules of practice that is parallel to the Mishnah properly so called) and from the Gemara, the commentary on the Mishnah found in the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds. This is by no means all. The collection begins with certain ancient prayers, such as the Shema, the Eighteen Blessings, the Qaddish, and grace after meals. Then follows, out of its order with good reason, the tractate Pirqe Abot or "sayings of the Fathers", and next come copious gleanings from the four juridical Midrashim. There are short, sometimes very short, introductions to the various tractates, and the work is completed by three excellent indexes, the first being a subject-index, then a list of passages in the Old Testament cited or commented by the rabbis, and an index to such passages of the New Testament as may be compared with the rabbinical writings.

Since the work is by its very title stated to be compiled *pour servir à l'intelligence du N.T.*, it is arguable that it might have been arranged after the manner of Strack and Billerbeck's *Kommentar*. Père Bonsirven has weighed the various possibilities, and has decided that it would be better to give what amounts to an analysis of the Jewish writings, so as to show more clearly what was the rabbinical conception of a commentary on Scripture or of an account of the traditional legislation. As such it is far more valuable than would be a collection of texts that merely supplemented his own outstanding work on *Le Judaïsme palestinien*. One could have wished for something like a commentary on the Talmudic extracts, but this would call for an even larger volume than the present one, large as it is.

So much for a useful book by a Christian scholar. Almost at the same time there has come to hand a work of Jewish scholarship by Professor D. Daube, already known for his *Studies in Biblical Law*, published in 1947.¹ The present, much larger volume is entitled *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*,² and it should be said at once that the title promises more than is actually achieved, though the book gives evidence of deep scholarship and contains many interesting suggestions. There

¹ Cfr. the discriminating review by Prof. G. R. Driver in the *Book List* of the Soc. for O.T. Study, 1947, p. 26.

² The Athlone Press, University of London. Pp. xviii + 460. Price £2 2s.

are three parts, the first of which (Messianic Types) considers the foreshadowing of the Messias in the types, Joseph, Moses, Samuel, Elias, and Ruth and Booz. Part II (Legislative and Narrative Forms) has chapters on such subjects as Precept and Example (dealing with the Sabbath and with divorce), a baptismal catechism (which describes the pattern of instruction for a Jewish proselyte), Public Retort and Private Explanation (identified as a specific rabbinical form, attested in Jewish sources from the first century A.D.), and Four Types of Question (apropos of Matthew xxii, 15 ff., and Mark xii, 13 ff.). Part III, which is longer than the other two put together, is styled "Concepts and Conventions" and takes as its subjects topics such as rabbinic authority, the laying on of hands, the *lex talionis*, violence to the kingdom (Matthew xi, 12; Luke xvi, 16), the Samaritan woman, and the Abomination of Desolation. There is an index of references to the Bible and the rabbinical works, but no alphabetical subject-index, and no lists of Semitic and Greek words. In this respect it is less complete than Dr Daube's earlier work, which contained a valuable Index of Terms Discussed. On the whole, this book suffers from being unsystematically planned and arranged, and from being made up largely of articles from periodicals.

The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum by Dr G. Zuntz is a work that presents in printed form the Schweich lectures of the British Academy for 1946, but was not published until 1953.¹ Dr Zuntz has already made his name as a textual critic by his studies on *The Ancestry of the Harklean New Testament* and *The Byzantine Text in New Testament Criticism*, published respectively in 1945 and 1942, the first in the Academy's supplemental papers, the second in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (Vol. xliv, pp. 25–30). The present work is largely restricted to a minute investigation of the *Corpus Paulinum* as it is found in the manuscripts of 1 Corinthians and Hebrews. To appreciate it in its entirety it is necessary to have before one the edition of the *Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri* (Fasc. iii, supplement) prepared by the late Sir Frederic Kenyon, and issued by Emery Walker Ltd in 1936.² This is the text of P. 46, part of

¹ Oxford Press. Pp. xvi + 295. Price 27s. 6d.

² Emery Walker Ltd, 45 Great Russell Street. Pp. xx + 156.

the "find" made known in the years between 1930 and 1933. The purpose of the work is, as usual in textual criticism, to find the oldest and most reliable text, and, in a brilliant little sketch of the present position in such studies, Dr Zuntz emphasizes that the enquiry cannot be carried out mechanically. "At every stage the critic has to use his brains. Were it different, we could put the critical slide-rule into the hands of any fool and leave it to him to settle the problems of the New Testament text (p. 12). The second part of the first lecture is taken up with the features peculiar to "the oldest extant manuscript" (P. 46), the tests to be applied to it and its relation to various other witnesses, in particular to Codex B (Vaticanus), Codex D (Bezae, the chief representative of the so-called Western text), and the Byzantine text.

In the second lecture, on the main groups of the evidence in their relation to P. 46, there is a detailed comparison of P. 46 with the B text and, at far greater length, with the Western text, which is contrasted also with B, and the important minuscule 1739. One of many interesting conclusions (pp. 150-1) is that "Byzantine readings which recur in Western witnesses *must* be ancient. They go back to the time before the Chester Beatty papyrus was written; the time before the emergence of separate Eastern and Western traditions; in short, they reach back deep into the second century." Chapter II of the second lecture deals with various types of variant readings. Perhaps the most significant pages are those of division v: "Variants bearing upon grammatical detail." For these it may be helpful to consult Professor C. F. D. Moule's *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*, published by the Cambridge Press in 1953.

The third lecture is entitled "Testing the Oldest Evidence" and involves a survey of early writers such as the apostolic fathers, the Gnostics, Marcion, Clement of Alexandria, and the scribe and correctors of P. 46. From all this the two leading conclusions appear to be that the Alexandrian group represents normally a good and reliable tradition, but that we must regard with great respect agreements of the average late manuscripts with Western readings. On one point, it seems to me, Dr Zuntz's great caution and restraint temporarily desert him, namely on the reading *chôris theou* in Hebrew ii, 9, in place of

chariti theou. Those who are interested may consult the first volume of Père Spicq's great commentary at p. 419.

People who already possess the Italian original of Abbot Ricciotti, *Storia d'Israele*, which was noticed in this REVIEW on its first appearance (cfr. Vol. VII, 430, and Vol. IX, 442) or the excellent French translation *Histoire d'Israël* by P. Auvray, published in 1947, may not find any great wish to possess the English translation by Fathers C. della Penna, O.P., and R. T. Murphy, O.P.¹ It has been made from a slightly later edition of the Italian (the fourth, of 1947) than that available to the Abbé Auvray, and the archaeological details have been brought up to date. Many of the essential extra-Biblical texts, which until recently could only be obtained in such collections as G. A. Cooke's *North Semitic Inscriptions* or in Gressmann's German work, are now easily available in Pritchard's useful *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, the second edition of which contains Phoenician and South Arabian texts. Here, in the English version of Ricciotti, the letters ANET refer to Pritchard's volume. In spite of the translators' explanations, it seems to be a matter for regret that the bibliographical notes at the end of Ricciotti's volumes in both the Italian and the French editions should here be often compressed into footnotes or eliminated altogether.² It may be true that references to French and German works are not always helpful to an English reader of a work of *haute vulgarization*, but it is also true that such works are often the only ones to be had. A student of Israelite history who cannot read French or German will be poorly provided for an encounter with these difficult questions.

The illustration of the stele of Hammurabi on p. 207 of Volume I, describes it as being "74 feet high", a misprint for 7.4. (In another work of Ricciotti, *Paul the Apostle*, the translator has stated that the Corinth canal is "600 miles long", at p. 41!) Such slips are not at all typical and this careful and readable translation, impatiently awaited for more twenty years, will be of immense service to teachers and students alike.

JOHN M. T. BARTON

¹ *The History of Israel*. Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1955. 2 vols. Pp. xii + 430 and x + 476. Price 15 dollars the set.

² It is only fair to add that a number of footnotes remain in their original form or even give a fuller bibliography. Complete omissions are rare.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

IMPOTENTIA ABSOLUTA: MODUS AGENDI

I have the case of a marriage in which there is absolute impotency on the part of the woman, discovered only after the marriage. I believe there is no obligation on their part to separate or bring the matter to the notice of the diocesan court, if they do not want to. What I cannot understand is—why not? Indeed may one leave them in good faith when they are in proximate occasion of grievous sin and scandal? (L.)

REPLY

Canon 1068, §1: Impotentia antecedens et perpetua, sive ex parte viri, sive ex parte mulieris, sive alteri cognita sive non, sive absoluta sive relativa, matrimonium ipso naturae iure dirimit.

S.C.C., 15 December 1877. Q. Quaenam esse debeat agendi ratio Episcopi, Parochi, Confessarii erga impotentes qui non separantur ab invicem.

R. Vivant uti frater et soror; quod si id fieri non possit sine peccati periculo separantur omnino.¹

A marriage is null if there is antecedent and perpetual impotency. It is not necessarily null if there is present absolute impotency, because absolute impotency may be curable. Impotency *ex parte mulieris* is present: (a) Si femina vagina caret; (b) si eam omnino habet occlusam seu impenetrabilem; (c) si nimis arctam sive absolute sive relative; (d) si laborat vaginismo i.e. hyperesthesia vulvae quae contactum viri tolerare nequit.”² The three last mentioned may be curable if the defect can be removed by an operation which is not dangerous to life.³ And it is interesting to note that since its reorganization in 1909 the Rota has never admitted the nullity of a marriage

¹ A.A.S., X, p. 504.

² S.R.Rot. *Decisiones*, Vol. 35, pp. 20–1.

³ Davis, IV, ii, p. 124.

ex mero vaginismo, because of the difficulty of proving that it is perpetual.¹ It is therefore essential that the priest should be certain of the antecedent and perpetual condition of the impotency before he raises any of the questions which our correspondent mentions.

But if there is no doubt about the nullity of the marriage through the impediment of impotency, what then? It is not true to say *tout court*, as our correspondent does, that there is no obligation on their part to separate or to bring the matter to the notice of the courts. All the authors admit that if they are in good faith, they may be left so, but only if the impotency is occult and separation is morally impossible.² We will discuss the justification of this procedure later. If they are not in good faith, that is if even one of the parties knows of the irremediable invalidity of the marriage, then they have an obligation to separate. This is the teaching of all the writers.³ Thus Vlaming:⁴ "Quodsi de impotentia ut supra constet, separari *debent* partes ab invicem quoad thorum . . . quoad habitationem vero, *separandi sunt* auctoritate iudicis ecclesiastici. . . ." Again, Gasparri:⁵ ". . . Conjuges, cum impotentiae certitudine, *debent*, quoad torum, illoco propria auctoritate separari. . . . Deinde ratione scandali petant a legitimo superiore ecclesiastico separationem quoad habitationem." And McCarthy:⁶ "In the normal case knowledge of the incurable invalidity will *necessitate* separation." Ordinarily then there is an obligation on the parties to separate at once *quoad torum* and to put the case to the ecclesiastical authorities for a declaration of nullity. Exceptionally they may be allowed to live as brother and sister. The question is: what are these exceptional cases? The authors are guarded. Payen⁷ writes: "Ob periculum incontinentiae, vix umquam, etiamsi separatio sit moraliter impossibilis, permitti potest cohabitatio more fratris et sororis conjugibus qui sciunt alterutrum ex eis certo impotentem." Gasparri⁸ quotes the reply of

¹ *Ami du Clergé*, 1952, p. 727.

² Payen. *De Matrimonio*, III, n. 1002.

³ I.E.R., 1952, p. 378.

⁴ Vlaming. *Praeleciones*, I, n. 275 bis.

⁵ Gasparri. *Tract. de Matrimonio*, I, n. 549.

⁶ I.E.R., ibid.

⁷ Payen. Ibid. 4.

⁸ Gasparri, ibid.

the Sacred Congregation of the Council (15 December 1877) and comments: "At hoc periculum semper adesse solet, ideoque id eis permittendum non est, nisi sint valde senes, aut, separati a toro, specialia praebeant argumenta se castitatis virtutem servaturos esse." But the exceptional cases do exist. The Congregation of the S.R. and U. Inquisition in a reply to a question on this matter said:¹ "Mens est quod cum matrimonium revalidari nequeat, putati conjuges illico separari debent. Si vero hoc moraliter impossibile sit saltem adhibitis cautelis sub eodem tecto cohabitent uti frater et soror." The judgement whether they can be permitted to live in this way will be made from our knowledge of the parties and by the application of the principles governing those in a proximate occasion of sin. If the occasion is a necessary one then it may be permitted so long as efficacious means are taken to make it remote. Ter Haar² lists a number of reasons which would make the occasion a necessary one. "Haec necessitas adesse potest v.g. (a) si (partes) iam inierunt matrimonium civile quod rumpi nequeat; (b) si cui ex separatione damnum valde grave vel gravis infamia oriatur (haec tamen ratio non facile admittatur, utpote ob passionem exaggerata); (c) si femina, ait S. Alphonsus, nequiret manuum labore se alere, aut in aliqua domo servire, aut mendicare sine dedecore aut aliquo gravi incommodo." The parties might invoke one of these reasons for remaining under the same roof and, if they gave proof of their ability to live in continence, they could be permitted to live as brother and sister. The parish priest or confessor however should submit the case to the Ordinary for his judgement. "Summopere caveat confessarius, ne in re adeo gravis momenti ac tot difficultatibus obnoxia temere procedat aut quidquam propria auctoritate decernat; . . . immo, nobis videtur, confessarius . . . neque ipsis ea de re consulentibus ultimo respondebit, nisi ipse prius consulenter Episcopum."³

That those who are in good faith may be left so if the impediment is occult is the teaching of all the moralists without exception. Such a course of action is justified on the general

¹ Cf. *Collationes Brugenses*, 5, p. 386.

² *Casus Conscientiae*, I, n. 165.

³ Jorio. *Theol. Mor.*, III, n. 1070, quoting Cardinal Gousset.

principle that it is lawful to tolerate an evil to avoid a greater one. Where people are in good faith there is no question of formal evil and leaving them in invincible ignorance saves them from formal sin. In this case although the parties are living in an occasion of sin, it is not a proximate occasion of *formal* sin. If it were they would have to be told the facts.¹ One imagines that if a case of this kind is brought to the notice of the confessor, it is because there is already some doubt in the minds of the penitents. But the doubt may easily be about the lawfulness of acts and not about the validity of the marriage. In this case "Confessarius non plus respondeat quam poenitens interroget."² He may thus leave them in good faith about the validity of the marriage, while warning them against acts which are not permitted even to married people.³

THE PURELY PENAL LAW: DOES IT EXIST?

I believe there is a serious doubt about the very existence of the penal law. Personally I have never understood the fundamental reason for a special category of law whose observance does not bind in conscience, but the penalty for whose violation does. Davis implies that if the State attaches a penalty to the law, such law is penal and does not bind in conscience. Is that correct? (R. D.)

REPLY

The idea of the purely penal law is an extension of the principle acknowledged in some religious orders that the rules do not bind in conscience. When it was first applied to law in general by (it would appear) Henri de Gand (1293),⁴ it was accepted without challenge. St Thomas on the other hand does

¹ *Ibid.*, n. 571.

² Aertnys-Damen. *Theol. Mor.*, II, n. 437.

³ Cf. Jorio. *Ibid.*, n. 1047, 3.

⁴ Crowe, C.S.S.R., *The Moral Obligation of Paying Just Taxes*, p. 85. This a Doctorate thesis submitted to the Catholic University of America. We are indebted to it for much of the material of this answer. Father Crowe does not agree that there are purely penal laws.

not seem to have entertained the possibility of such a law, and, from the time of Suarez, when the notion began to be more fully analysed, there have been moralists of repute who have vigorously condemned the concept of purely penal law as "puerile, hollow and useless".¹ Today the manualists, almost without exception,² admit the existence of this type of law, but it has been the subject of sustained attack in the periodicals and in some specific treatises on law.³

The main objections are: (a) Law of its essence involves a moral obligation and there is no possible moral bond except an obligation in conscience. (b) A penalty is a means to ensuring the observance of the law and not an end in itself. In a purely penal law the end is accepted as less obligatory than the means. (c) A penalty presupposes guilt, yet there is no moral guilt in the transgression of the purely penal law. (d) Laws are made for the common good. To break them is to act against the common good. This is unreasonable and therefore sinful.⁴

Formidable reasons, indeed! But the arguments adduced by the protagonists of the penal law theory are at least equally convincing. The fundamental reason for the origin of the theory is that "peccata non sunt multiplicanda sine necessitate". Human reason baulks at the thought of such a multiplicity of sins. The Synod of Toledo in 1335 stated, "Lest the faithful be burdened by the weight of sin, we ordain that that the provincial constitutions do not bind the transgressors to sin, but only to the penalty."⁵ The legislators evidently saw not only the unwise, but also the unreasonableness, of constantly adding to the occasions of sin in which their subjects might find themselves. This is particularly so of civil laws which at the present day are so numerous and complex and often so ephemeral.⁶ Even those who uphold the view that all laws bind in conscience recognize this difficulty and allow of frequent exceptions

¹ D.T.C., art. "Lois", col. 906.

² Noldin, Ferreres, Jorio, Regatillo, Vermeersch, Damen, Wouters, Fanfani, Prummer—all admit the purely penal law.

³ E.g. Renard, *La Valeur de la Loi* (Paris 1928); Brisbois, *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, 1938, pp. 1072-4; Lopez, *Periodica*, 1938, pp. 203-16; 1940, pp. 23-33; Woroniecki, *Angelicum*, 1941, p. 386.

⁴ Crowe, Op. cit., p. 95.

⁵ Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio*, 26, col. 442.

⁶ Regatillo, *Theologia Moralis*, I, n. 466.

to the rule on the grounds of *epikeia* or the power of self-dispensation.¹ We do not necessarily admit that all civil laws are purely penal, but it scarcely seems reasonable to claim that all civil laws bind under sin. The common opinion of citizens, for example, that refuses to regard a man who parks his car for more than an hour where this is forbidden as being guilty of sin is surely based on sweet reasonableness, even if it is incapable of justifying its view by reasoned argument.

The view can, however, be justified by answering the objections which we have stated above. In the first place it is not of the essence of law to bind in conscience but only to effect the observance of the *rationis ordinatio* for the common good. And if this can be done by means of a penalty then the essence of law is preserved. Secondly there is nothing unreasonable in the fact that the end (law) is less obligatory than the means (penalty). The relationship of means to end rests on the effectiveness of the one to secure the observance of the other; and if the penalty is effective, it is playing its proper rôle as a means to an end. Thirdly, while penalty implies guilt, it does not necessarily imply moral guilt, but only juridical guilt, as with the person who unwittingly breaks the law of the land. Finally, though all laws contribute to the common good, not all do so in a necessary and proximate manner. If the common good can be achieved by means of laws which do not bind under sin, there is nothing unreasonable about such a method of achieving it. We have been able only to summarize the arguments of both sides to the dispute, and we realize that the reasons in favour of the penal law theory are not completely convincing. Nevertheless we regard them as equally probable with the arguments against the view. They, along with the weight of extrinsic authority, give the theory solid probability.

The questioner is a little hard on Father Davis.² While we are inclined to disagree with his view that civil law in England is merely penal except where it more exactly determines the natural law, we are prepared to bow to his greater experience and superior judgement. But it is not true to say that he holds that if the State attaches a penalty to a law, the law is by that

¹ Cf. *American Eccles. Rev.*, Oct. 1853, p. 248.

² Davis, *Moral and Pastoral Theology*, I, p. 147.

fact alone to be judged a penal law. The attachment of a penalty is *one* indication insufficient in itself. He gives five such indications which, taken cumulatively, point to the purely penal character of the law. As well as the penalty, there is the fact that the observance of the law is effectually secured by public authority, that law is strictly administered, that legislators never appear to rely on anything but penalty, and that common opinion regards the laws as penal. Taken together these can be read as signs that the legislator intends only to bind directly to the penalty and thus to secure the observance of the law.

T. C.

DEFERMENT OF ABSOLUTION—CURRENT PRACTICE

Is it the custom in England never to defer absolution, even in cases of restitution, if one is reasonably sure of the good dispositions of the penitent? (C.)

REPLY

Canon 886: "Si Confessarius dubitare nequeat de poenitentis dispositionibus et hic absolutionem petat, absolutio nec deneganda, nec differenda est."

The legislator, by thus limiting his doctrinal guidance to the case in which the confessor *must* absolve, has left unsolved the centuries-old controversy about the degree of assurance needed by the confessor in order that he *may* absolve unconditionally. Needless to say, it is not easy to summarize a controversy on which so much ink has been spilt, and the difficulty is not lessened by the failure of many of the disputants to divide the matter in such fashion as to make their precise meaning clear. It may help, however, if we begin by assessing the measure of agreement.¹

¹ For a more detailed review of the controversy, cf. McCarthy, in *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, January 1946, pp. 41 ff. Ter Haar gives a very full statement and defence of the more common opinion (*De Occasionariis et Recidivis*, Marietti, Turin, 1939, pp. 322 ff.), and Cappello may be taken as representative of the less common view (*De Sacramentis*, II, nn. 770-92).

If the confessor cannot doubt the sufficiency of the penitent's dispositions, it is certain, at least from canon 886, that he must normally grant an immediate and unconditional absolution. If he cannot doubt the insufficiency of the penitent's dispositions, it is equally certain that he is bound, *sub gravi* and without exception, to refuse absolution; though, needless to say, he is bound in charity not to resort to this drastic step until, without avail, he has done his best to secure the necessary minimum of sorrow for the past and firm purpose for the future. If he has some reason for thinking the penitent duly disposed, but scarcely a probable reason, it is likewise agreed that, as a general rule, he must at least defer absolution until he has sufficient evidence for a prudent decision either way. Finally, if the confessor's favourable judgement amounts to a positive, solid and prudent probability, undisturbed by any *serious* reason to fear the contrary, all agree that he *may* absolve him unconditionally, because it is in this sense that St Alphonsus¹ and his many followers interpret the loose kind of moral certainty which they require for lawful absolution; and some, like Cappello,² add that he *must* normally absolve, because this is equivalently the case envisaged by canon 886.

The main controversy is therefore more or less limited to the case in which the confessor's favourable judgement, though solidly probable, is accompanied by a serious reason to fear the contrary. According to the common opinion, i.e. that of St Alphonsus, the presence of this serious reason to the contrary is incompatible with the required moral certainty, even in its loose sense, and therefore the confessor may not absolve, except conditionally in grave necessity, but must at least defer absolution until more evidence is forthcoming. A few authors, however, would allow him to absolve, though not all of them make it clear whether they mean unconditionally. Thus Cappello writes: "potest quidem absolvere, sed non tenetur, nisi urgeat necessitas moraliter sumpta".³ Genicot likewise held that absolution could be given, though it would sometimes be lawful to defer it for the benefit of the penitent,⁴ but Salsmans, his

¹ *Theologia Moralis*, lib. VI, tract. iv, n. 461.

² Op. cit., n. 774.

³ Loc. cit. Similarly Davis, *Moral and Pastoral Theology* (1935 ed.), III, p. 276.

⁴ *Institutiones Theologiae Moralis* (1898 edition), II, n. 367.

successor, must have been uneasy about this doctrine, for he eventually qualified Genicot's "posse" with the condition, "posita causa proportionata ad eam dandam", required that the absolution, if given, be conditional, and changed Genicot's "differre licebit" to "differre omnino praestabit".¹ Moreover, the practical difference between the majority and minority views is not as great as it might seem, because all agree that absolution may be given conditionally, in these circumstances, for a grave enough reason of necessity.

Coming now to the precise point raised in the question, and duly emphasizing the difficulty of accurately determining the prevalent local custom in a highly confidential matter of this kind, we hazard the guess that confessors in this country do not normally (we evidently cannot say never) defer absolution, even in cases of restitution, when they are reasonably sure of the good dispositions of the penitent. It will be clear, in the light of the above controversy, that the correctness of this custom (if we have guessed it right) depends largely on what our questioner means by "reasonably sure". If the confessor's reasonable assurance is such as to exclude prudent fear of the contrary, one might imagine that deferment is totally excluded by the unqualified prohibition of canon 886: "nec differenda est". This, however, is not the general conclusion of commentators. Most pre-Code authors allowed deferment, even in cases of this kind, for the spiritual benefit of the penitent; and this view is still strongly defended, on the ground that canon 886 is primarily directed against the Jansenist error that a penitent may not be absolved until his good dispositions have been experimentally proved, and does not envisage the case in which absolution is deferred for his spiritual benefit.² Nevertheless, in view of the clause in the canon, "et hic absolutionem petat", we are inclined to agree with Cappello that a confessor who is unable to doubt the dispositions of the penitent may not defer absolution, even for his spiritual benefit, unless the latter withdraws his petition for immediate absolution by consenting to its deferment.³

¹ Loc. cit. (1946 edition).

² Cf. Vermeersch, *Theologia Moralis*, III, n. 493; Genicot-Salsmans, op. cit., II, n. 366; Ter Haar, *De conferenda absolutione sacramentali iuxta c. 886 C.I.C.*, Rome, 1920; and in his *De Occasionariis et Recidivis*, pp. 359 ff.

³ Op. cit., n. 786-7.

When, on the other hand, the confessor's reasonable assurance admits of prudent fear to the contrary, the common opinion, as we have seen, requires him to defer absolution, unless a grave reason of necessity justifies him in giving it conditionally. Our impression, however, for what it is worth, is that confessors in this country, if they follow the common opinion, experience little difficulty in deciding that the requisite excuse of necessity is present; and therefore that, given a reasonable assurance of either kind, they seldom defer absolution, even in cases of restitution. If this be indeed the current practice, there is this much to be said for it: in a country and age in which the whole social climate is adverse to religious practice, so that it takes a major effort on the part of grave sinners to come to confession and pledge themselves to reparation and amendment, a deferred penitent is not very likely to make the effort twice.

EUCARISTIC FAST—CONSULTATION OF CONFESSOR

At a Mass-centre where the only Sunday Mass is at 9.30 a.m., some twenty-five to forty-five communicate every week, and their only real chance of consulting the priest is during the brief period available before Mass, when he hears confessions. (i) Must every intending communicant, who has taken a drink of tea an hour before, consult the priest every week before receiving Holy Communion? Or, seeing that the same situations arise every Sunday, may the priest, after explaining the conditions required for the relaxation of the fast, grant a general permission to all who fulfil them? (ii) Only about one person does, in fact, ask each week, though it is almost certain that most of the communicants have taken a cup of tea before leaving home. If weekly consultation is required, must the correct procedure now be urged, notwithstanding the difficulty of access to the priest? (iii) Can the priest *ever* reasonably refuse permission to those who ask if they may receive Holy Communion, when they have taken a cup of tea, an hour earlier, on the assumption that they would get permission? (J.O.H.)

REPLY

Christus Dominus, Norm V: "Christifideles pariter, etiamsi non infirmi, qui ob grave incommodum—hoc est, ob debilitatem laborem, ob tardiores horas, quibus tantum ad Sacram Synaxim accedere possint, vel ob longinquum iter, quod susciperre debeant—ad Eucharisticam mensam omnino ieuni adire nequeant, de prudenti confessarii consilio, hac perdurante necessitate, aliquid sumere possunt per modum potus, exclusis alcoholicis; a quo tamen se abstineant saltem per spatium unius horae, antequam Angelico enutriantur Pane."

Holy Office Instruction, 6 January 1953, n.11: "Causae quidem gravis incommodi sunt prudenter a confessario pensatae in foro interno sacramentali vel non sacramentali; neque absque eiusdem consilio fideles non ieuni sanctissimam Eucharistiam recipere possunt. Confessarius autem consilium eiusmodi dare potest etiam *semel pro semper*, causa eadem gravis incommodi perdurante."

i. There is no need for any intending communicant, infirm or not, to consult a confessor every week, in order to benefit by the fasting concession of *Christus Dominus*. The Holy Office Instruction, appended to it, explicitly allows the confessor to give his opinion, "once and for all", with effect for as long as the circumstances remain the same. So, in the present case, if communicants claim the concession because of the distance to church, or the lateness of the hour, once the confessor has verified that their claim is canonically justified, he may pronounce the concession usable for as long as the declared inconvenience endures. Some would say that their claim is automatically justified, because 9.30 a.m. is certainly a late hour for the purposes of the law; and this view is probable enough, at least extrinsically, to be safely followed. According however to the more intrinsically probable opinion, which is likely to be sustained in any future authentic interpretation, and for which, therefore, it would seem prudent to prepare the faithful, the canonical cause of inconvenience must actually involve a serious inconvenience to the person concerned, and it is primarily this personal reaction that the confessor is required to verify.

As to whether he can express this required opinion collectively to a group of persons, there is likewise dispute. It seems morally certain that he must not *normally* do so, because the above-quoted Instruction requires his advice to be given "in foro interno". Hürth and Castellano, both of whom are in close touch with the Holy Office, declare that it may *never* be given collectively, because an individual consultation is necessary, in every case, in order to determine the personal effect of the statutory inconvenience.¹ The same conclusion is reached by Ahearne and Conway, and, according to the latter, by Regatillo and Obernhumer.² At most therefore, according to these authors, the group can be collectively informed that they all appear to fulfil the conditions in which, upon individual consultation of a confessor, they can use the concession. Many other commentators, however, are prepared to admit an exception to the rule of individual consultation. They hold that if the confessor is morally certain of the verification of the required conditions in regard to every single member of a particular group, he may give them collective advice to this effect, and they may lawfully act upon it. Coronata,³ while claiming the former opinion to be "the more true", admits the latter to be "the more common".⁴ It is certainly probable and can safely be followed, unless and until an authentic interpretation is issued to the contrary. In view of this possibility, however, and of the small number of people involved in the present case, we suggest it would be wiser simply to inform them collectively of the availability of the concession and urge them to put their case individually to a confessor, if they have not already done so.

ii. If many of the communicants have been using the con-

¹ Hürth, *Periodica*, 1953, p. 62; Castellano, *Monitor Ecclesiasticus*, 1953, p. 400.

² Ahearne, *The Apostolic Constitution "Christus Dominus"*, p. 7; Conway, *The New Law on the Eucharistic Fast*, p. 40; Regatillo, *Sal Terrae*, 1953, p. 175; Obernhumer, *Theologisch-Praktische Quartalschrift*, 1953, p. 219. This opinion is implicitly supported by a private reply of the Holy Office to Trieste, 13 February 1953, which declared that "the confessor cannot give advice by letter, telephone, or third person" (*Palestra del Clero*, 1953, p. 862).

³ *De Nova Disciplina Ieiunii Eucharistici*, n. 29.

⁴ It is held by Bride, *L'Ami du Clergé*, 1953, p. 206, 322-23; Boschi, *Palestra del Clero*, 1953, p. 756; Carpentier, *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, 1953, p. 407; Reed, *Theological Studies*, 1953, p. 229; Meunier, *Revue Ecclesiastique de Liège*, 1953, p. 8; Connell, *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, 1953, p. 252; and it is hesitantly conceded by Jombart, *Revue de Droit Canonique*, 1953, p. 75; Moriarty, *The Jurist*, 1954, p. 24; Ford, *The New Eucharistic Legislation*, pp. 66-7.

cession without obtaining the advice of a confessor either singly or collectively, the law should be explained to them and the abuse rectified.

iii. The advice of a confessor is required, not primarily in order that liquid nourishment may be taken, but that Holy Communion may be received after it. A confessor can never therefore reasonably refuse a person permission to communicate merely because he has anticipated the confessor's decision, presuming that it would be favourable. The confessor does not, in any case, give permission. He expresses an expert opinion, and this opinion must be based simply on the law and the facts. If the applicant's case appears to fulfil the requirements of the law, he must be declared free to communicate; and if it does not, he must be told that he cannot communicate.

In the present case, it is most unlikely that the confessor will have to disappoint any intending communicant. According to a widely held view, they all qualify for the concession by the mere fact that they can only communicate at a late hour; and even if, as we believe, a serious personal inconvenience arising from this fact is further required, the confessor will normally be justified in presuming that those who take the trouble to seek his advice do experience such an inconvenience in observing the full fast.

L. L. McR.

GENUFLXION AT COMMUNION

Should persons receiving Holy Communion genuflect on approaching the altar and after the reception of the Sacred Host? (B. B.)

REPLY

The only rule found in the rubrics concerning those who approach the altar for Holy Communion is that given for the clergy in the Ceremonial of Bishops (II, xxix, 3), which directs them to do so *debitis reverentiis*, which means a genuflexion; and says nothing about their departure after Holy Communion.

The accepted practice for clerics—who, normally, receive Holy Communion kneeling on the footpace—is that they genuflect (usually in fours) before ascending and after having descended. *A priori* one would think that those who descend should depart to their places without a genuflexion since they are now carrying within them the Sacred Species. The purpose of the second genuflexion seems to be the observance of external respect towards the Blessed Sacrament being then distributed to others. The practice of the laity varies in different countries; it appears that in Italy, France and Spain, the two genuflexions are usually made; in England and Ireland they are made by some, but, generally speaking, they are omitted, especially the one after Holy Communion. In small congregations, subject to training and discipline (e.g. in religious communities or schools) the practice of the clergy is, however, often followed. In view of all this a query was submitted to the Congregation of S. Rites: "Should those who come to Holy Communion genuflect both on approaching and before departing? On one or both knees?" S.R.C. replied: "Yes, on one knee" (18 July 1942).¹ This reply, which was general, and did not distinguish between clergy and laity, confirms the general practice of clerics and of disciplined communities at Holy Communion. But what about large congregations of undisciplined persons in big churches? Unless they are very skilfully marshalled, their genuflexions before Holy Communion—and much more after its reception, when it is very important to get them away quickly from the Communion-rail—will cause serious delay and no small confusion. Hence it would seem that in such cases we can, in these islands, invoke a legal custom *contra legem* (indeed, there is no clear law at all) for dispensing with, at least, the second genuflexion.

THE PLACE OF THE EPISTLE

Many manuals of ceremonial direct the subdeacon at High Mass to stand for the singing of the Epistle at the foot of the altar steps, where he had been for the chanting of the collect, and this is the common practice. Is this correct? (J. J. S.)

¹ This reply was first published by *Ephemerides Liturgicae* only in December 1954.

REPLY

It would seem not. No rubric directs the subdeacon to sing the Epistle at the foot of the altar steps. The rubric of the Missal (*Ritus*, VI, 4) tells him to go "ad partem Epistolae contra altare"—it does not say "in cornu Epistolae". The Ceremonial of Bishops (II, viii, 40) says that the subdeacon sings the Epistle "a latere sinistro¹ altaris". Originally the Epistle and Gospel were sung *quite away* from the altar, in the ambo.² For the Gospel this is still done to this extent that there is a procession away from the altar to some spot at a distance before the Gospel group is formed. Why should not the rubrics concerning the Epistle be similarly interpreted so as to maintain the traditional idea for the Epistle also? The rubrics direct the subdeacon to genuflect *in medio* before going to sing the Epistle; they do not say that he is to genuflect on the lowest altar step, which is the common practice. In any case, if the subdeacon is to remain at the foot of the steps—where he has hitherto been—to sing the Epistle, why should he genuflect at all before and after the singing of it? The genuflexion is ordered precisely because he quits the immediate ambit of the altar and so is directed to salute it before leaving and on his return. The Epistle is intended for the instruction of the entire assembly, and it is desirable that it be sung from a spot where it can be heard by all without difficulty. Indeed nowadays there is question of petitioning the Holy See to allow the Epistle (and Gospel) to be sung in the vernacular and facing the people. Modern rubricians now teach that the Epistle is to be sung at a distance from the foot of the altar, and this is the practice of the more correct churches.

THE PLACE OF THE BAPTISTERY

When building a church where exactly should the baptistery be placed? (S. O'R.)

¹ Looking from the altar.

² They may still be so sung where it is the custom. *C.E.*, II, viii, 40; cf. I, xii, 18.

REPLY

No spot is expressly prescribed for the baptistery. The traditional spot is at the north-east corner of the church, this is for a symbolical reason, the north being traditionally associated with the darkness of paganism. The baptistery should be close to an entrance porch—normally near the main door of the church—since the first part of the baptismal rite is carried out *ad limen ecclesiae ubi foris expectant qui infantem detulerunt* (Roman Ritual, II, i, 68);¹ and for a mystical reason because the child (adult) enters the church by the door of baptism. In a church that has not got a great west door the baptistery may take the form of a chapel at the west end—in the middle of the west end wall—but it should be reasonably near an entrance porch.

On the other hand there must be access *into the church* from the baptistery. When carrying out the baptismal rite the priest does not pass directly from the porch into the baptistery, he must *pass through the church* in order to carry out a part of the ceremony. He introduces the child into the church (*Ingredere in templum Dei*), leads him and his sponsors towards the baptistery, but does not enter it directly. He must first stand with his back turned to the baptistery and there carry out the exorcism, *Ephpheta*, renunciation of Satan, and the anointing with the Oil of Catechumens. Only then—having changed his stole from the penitential violet into the joyful white one—does he enter the baptistery for the actual baptism (R.R., II, ii, 12–17).² Accordingly, it is incorrect so to place a baptistery when building a church that there is not access to it from the church, but only from the porch.

EPISTLE AND GOSPEL IN ENGLISH AT MASS

In a church where there is no second priest available to do so, may a layman read aloud to the congregation the Epistle

¹ For the baptism of an adult: "Sacerdos procedit ad fines ecclesiae, et stat in limine: catechizandus vero extra limen." R.R., II, iv, 5.

² At the baptism of an adult: *Tunc ducitur Electus ad baptisterium.* R.R., II, iv, 37.

and Gospel (or Passion on Palm Sunday and Good Friday) in English while the celebrant reads them in Latin? (W.)

REPLY

This is quite permissible at Low Mass unless the Ordinary or synodal law forbids it.¹ At a sung Mass (at which the rubrics suppose the Epistle to be chanted by a cleric—*Ritus Celebrandi*, VI, 8—or, if there is not one available, at which a reply of S.R.C., 3350,¹ allows the celebrant to sing the Epistle) this is permissible also if and while the celebrant reads it only. It is not then allowed for the Gospel, until after the celebrant has chanted this. At High Mass the Epistle and Gospel must, of course, be sung in Latin by the subdeacon and deacon, unless there is an indult to allow otherwise. Such an indult was granted by the Holy Office in February 1955 to the Archbishop of Paris, permitting the subdeacon after he had chanted the Epistle to read it in the vernacular, and the deacon to do the same for the Gospel. This was the renewal of an indult given by the same Holy Office in 1948 to the Bishop of Chartres. The indult laid down that the Scriptural pericopes must first be chanted in Latin and that the translation may not be sung. Recent liturgical congresses (e.g. the Congress of Lugano in 1953) have expressed a desire to the Holy See that even the celebrant himself (when there is a congregation present) might be permitted to read the Epistle and Gospel in the vernacular even at a low Mass.

PRAYERS AT EXPOSITION

During Exposition is it permissible for a lay person to recite aloud any prayers approved by the Ordinary during a public visit of school children? (W.)

¹ See Canon Mahoney's reply in THE CLERGY REVIEW, October 1955, p. 622.
Vol. xli

REPLY

There is no general law prohibiting this, provided the prayers, hymns, etc., that are used have been approved by the Holy See (e.g. the indulgenced prayers of the *Enchiridion Indulgentiarum*) or by the Ordinary. The hymns in the vernacular approved for England and Wales by the bishops may be sung. Liturgical texts (e.g. the *Te Deum*, *Lauda Sion*) may be sung only in Latin, but their translation may be recited (*S.R.C.*, 3537³).

J. B. O'C.

BOOK REVIEWS

St John Fisher. By E. E. Reynolds. (Burns & Oates. 25s.)

MR REYNOLDS' *Saint Thomas More* has admittedly replaced Father Bridgett's as the standard life of More and this companion volume, equally definitive and learned, will assuredly obtain the same verdict. The inevitable questions will be: to what extent does it embody new material, and does it fill any gaps in the story. The new material now used includes the Rochester Registers (not examined by Father Bridgett), accounts of three of Fisher's sermons and the text of a long prayer (probably composed in the Tower) which was first printed some time ago in *The Month*. The extracts from William Rastell and from George Cavendish come direct from their respective texts and not as in the re-written versions of the early biographer. The most important difference, however, is the use made of Father Van Ortry's edition (1891 and 1893) of the MS. of the earliest Life of John Fisher which used to be known as "Hall"; this was because a Latin version of it was made by Dr Richard Hall, a professor at Douay who died in 1604. The learned Bollandist, writing five years after the publication of Father Bridgett's work, ascribed the early biography to Dr John Young who was Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge under Queen Mary, and now Mr Reynolds has cautiously adopted that term for this basic work. For the episcopal registers he has had the expert assistance of the Rev. L. E. Whatmore. The present work may well be regarded as even superior to the author's Life of St Thomas More. It is less of a chronicle, more composed,

and in firmer outline, so that out of less wealth of material a clear portrait nevertheless emerges. Constructed with a complete knowledge of all the documents and a full understanding of the period, it is written with a quiet lucidity. The year of the canonization (1935) was the time for panegyric and eloquence; this definitive work has been accomplished with restrained and almost austere efficiency. There is only one quip: that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish Fact from Foxe.

A thing that every reader will notice is the degree in which the Saint is allowed to speak for himself. We have here his translation-paraphrase of the *De Profundis*; extracts from the panegyrics of Henry VII and the Lady Margaret; his account of The Field of Cloth of Gold; his memorandum of Ten Points—the basis of the *Confutation of Luther*; a further list of Ten Points against Luther's *De abroganda missa privata*; a lengthy sample of Fisher's Latin, translated by the late Mgr Hallett; Six Points set out for the Trial at Blackfriars; and letters to the King and to Cromwell. In addition, there are extracts from *The Spiritual Consolation* and *The Way to Perfect Religion* written for his half-sister,¹ Elizabeth White, who became a nun in the Dominican house at Dartford; these pieces are Fisher's parallel to More's *Dialogue of Comfort*.

The mere fact that so much has been written about Henry VIII and the beginnings of the Reformation in England imposes a difficulty upon the biographer of the two Saints and it is interesting to note how deftly Mr Reynolds has kept to his defined track. He resists the obvious temptation to expatiate on Christian Humanism and to exaggerate the Bishop's connexion with Colet, Erasmus and More. In the chapter "From Wyclif to Luther" he resists the temptation to describe once again the then state of religion in England, and when he comes to the Fifth Lateran Council and then to Clement VII's suggestion that Fisher should go to Rome to discuss the reform of abuses, he does not pause to discuss the demand for reform of the Church "in head and members". Fisher's essential character of shepherd of souls and his self-imposed mission as trainer of an educated and zealous clergy is kept clearly before the reader who can now quite clearly understand why the Saint would never leave anything for his work and would never quit that episcopal waiting-room, the poor little see of Rochester. Equally will he be struck by Fisher's clear perception of what the King (and Wolsey, indirectly) were bringing upon the Church in England. Fisher saw what was coming long before he had occasion to say, "the fort is betrayed".

¹ She was so like him that years afterwards Queen Mary knew her at sight.

Points that will be noticed are that Mr Reynolds does not appear to believe that the Nun of Kent was "coached" by Bocking and Hadley; he thinks it is impossible for us to assess her character or the degree of her integrity. Fisher evidently took a great deal more notice of that visionary than did More and Cromwell made a shrewd point when he told the Bishop that had her prophesying been in the King's favour he would have paid much less attention to them. Another is Fisher's expressed desire (in letters to Chapuys) that the Emperor should be called in to restrain Henry. On this point, so stressed by the non-Catholic writers, Mr Reynolds explains that the mediaeval idea of the main function of the Holy Roman Empire was not then completely lifeless and that it was still deemed to be the duty of the Emperor to prevent schism in Christendom at all costs; which of course is quite true.

Somewhat curious is the remark that the marriage of Henry and Anne Boleyn on 25 January 1533 was "necessary if her child was to be of legitimate birth". That was in any case impossible. The child (Elizabeth) must have been conceived in 1532; she was born on 7 September 1533 and it will be remembered that Anne had been created Marquess of Pembroke in the preceding October. It is quite true that in 1529 the Lords numbered about 90; but half of them at that date were Lords Spiritual, 21 diocesan bishops and 24 or 25 mitred abbots, whereas the latter were to disappear at the Dissolution. It is certainly not "an excessive estimate" to suggest £2,000,000 as the modern equivalent of the £100,000 exacted by Henry from Southern Convocation. Belloc proved long ago (it was a favourite point with him) that 20 was much too small a multiple, and the value of our money has greatly decreased since he did so.

Mr Reynolds concludes this fine work not with any peroration or personal summing-up but by quoting a vivid description by Mgr Richard Smith of an incident during the canonization ceremonies in 1935¹ and also Pole's noble tribute to Fisher from the *De Unitate Ecclesiae*.

There are nine good illustrations, seven of them portraits, in this handsome volume. A note inside the dust-cover calls attention to the portrait on the outside of it. This is the portrait bust ascribed to Torrigiani and traditionally believed to be the portrait of Fisher. The attribution was widely accepted and adopted in 1935, for purposes of illustration; but is it sound? Making allowance for stylization and even for flattery, was this suave and sophisticated figure really meant for the gaunt Yorkshireman whose homely features have been made familiar to us all by the masterly realism of Holbein?

¹ *The Clergy Review*, May 1935, p. 446.

Marty
C
MANY
Refor
of Bl
his m
exam
Scott
inter
matic
Mart
been
lucid
made
T
Dran
have
conce
in 15
into
Crich
in S
and
and
soug
plete
1613
Octo
ther
Prot
the J
the s
U
his r
itself
sure
accu
exam
Ogil
case
shou
at p

Martyr in Scotland. The Life and Times of John Ogilvie. By Thomas Collins. (Burns & Oates. 21s.)

MANY Scots Catholics must have suffered many things during the Reformation, but the outstanding case of judicial execution is that of Blessed John Ogilvie, S.J. (1579-1615). We know very little of his ministry, but we have an unusually full record of the prolonged examinations and of his trial which throws light not only upon Scottish affairs but on the mentality of James I, who took a personal interest in the case. Mr Collins has assembled a great deal of information and he includes in an Appendix the Apostolic Process on the Martyrdom and Beatification (1928-29). To him it has obviously been a labour of love, though a less journalistic tone and a more lucid arrangement, particularly in the early chapters, would have made a more readable book.

The martyr was the eldest son of Sir Walter Ogilvie, Laird of Dram, Banffshire. Though he had two Jesuit uncles, he is said to have received a Calvinistic upbringing; possibly because his father concealed his religion to preserve his property. John went abroad in 1592 at the very early age of thirteen and in 1596 was received into the Scots College of Douai, then at Louvain, by Father William Crichton, S.J. There he had Cornelius à Lapide for his instructor in Scripture. Three years later he became a Jesuit novice at Brunn, and in 1601 made his first vows at Gratz. In 1610 he was ordained and professed in Paris. Thereafter he earnestly and persistently sought permission to return as a missionary to Scotland, then completely denuded of priests. He arrived in Glasgow in November 1613 and laboured there for nearly a year, being arrested early in October 1614. Thenceforward until the martyrdom, 10 March 1615, there ensued a long duel between Ogilvie and Spottiswoode, the Protestant Archbishop of Glasgow, who left nothing undone to bring the Jesuit to the gallows. It is the record of this duel that constitutes the special interest of the present work.

Under the statutes Ogilvie had incurred the death penalty and his refusal to acknowledge any spiritual authority in his judges was itself treason according to an Act of 1584. To make assurance doubly sure, because "the King sentences none to death for religion", his accusers raised the question of the Deposing Power. In repeated examinations he was asked if the Pope could depose a heretic King. Ogilvie's answer was: "Many doctors have asserted this to be the case", and when asked what would *he* say, his reply was that, if it should be defined as a matter of faith, he would die for it, but that at present he was not bound to express an opinion. Then he was pressed about the Gunpowder Plot and told that the Pope had

canonized Garnett. Failing to break down the prisoner's skilful defence, Spottiswoode, who was a zealous and scrupulous Erastian, reported the matter to the King, asked his instructions and suggested that the Jesuit should be put to the torture of "The Boots". James's reply was that if there was nothing against him but saying Mass and being a Jesuit, he should be banished under pain of death if he returned; but if he "practised to stir up rebellion" or maintained the Pope's transcendent power over Kings, or refused the Oath of Allegiance, the law should take its course. Ogilvie, who had already been offered pardon and preferment, a wife and "royal gifts" if he would abjure his faith, was then removed to Edinburgh Castle where by the malice of Spottiswoode, who was enraged at being worsted in argument, he underwent the terrible ordeal of "enforced sleeplessness" for no less than eight days and nine nights—he was kept awake by relays of guards who pricked him with daggers—at the end of which time he had temporarily lost the use of his faculties. Recovering, he yet managed to write an account of his imprisonment, the *Relatio Incarcerationis*, for the information of his Superiors.

James I, who could not forget his controversy with Bellarmine and had evidently perused all the questions and answers, was much exercised by Ogilvie's argument. "What do we owe him more than our ancestors owed his? . . . Spiritual jurisdiction they neither had nor claimed: nor did they profess any other faith than the Catholic and Roman." The King accordingly drew up questions which he intended to be decisive.

1. Whether the Pope be judge and have power *in spiritualibus* over his Majesty and whether that power will reach over his Majesty even *in temporalibus* if it be *in ordine ad spiritualia*, as Bellarmine affirmeth.
2. Whether the Pope has power to excommunicate Kings (especially such as are not of his Church) as his Majesty.
3. Whether the Pope has power to depose Kings by him excommunicated, and in particular whether he have power to depose the King, his Majesty.
4. Whether the Pope has power to assail subjects from the oath of their born and natural allegiance to his Majesty.

It should be remembered that the "oath of born and natural allegiance" was an elaborate formula (the text is given here, in full) devised by Bancroft and Robert Cecil (not by Sir Christopher Perkins, as was formerly believed) ostensibly to repudiate the Deposing Power but in reality for the purpose of confusing and

dividing Catholics by extracting from those who took it a renunciation in opprobrious terms of virtually all Papal authority. Moreover, it was a trap, for it did not exempt those who took it from the operation of the other persecuting statutes. Every Catholic knew that it had been condemned by Rome. Before a full court at Edinburgh Ogilvie defended himself pertinaciously against an amount of abstract argument that he would not have met with in England. But his opinion about the Oath of Allegiance was enough: "It is a damnable oath, against God and his truth. . . . Since this Kingdom was Christian the Pope's supreme power was always acknowledged. . . . If the King would leave off his usurping against the Popes he could live without fear as well as the King of Spain or any Christian prince." Spottiswoode, who had been judge and prosecutor throughout, made the final speech to the jury on that issue; there was no attempt to prove that the prisoner had done, or sought to do, anything that could be called a treasonable act. After the verdict and sentence Ogilvie was taken back to Glasgow and promptly executed. He was spared the final horrors by the humane and apparently unauthorized action of the hangman.

The book is excellently produced and has five striking illustrations. On the dust-cover there is a sixth, showing Ogilvie as a young layman being instructed by Father Cornelius à Lapide.

St Francis of Assisi. A Pictorial Biography. Translated from the German by Sebastian Bullough, O.P. By Leonard von Matt and Walter Hauser. (Longmans. 30s.)

THIS is a companion volume to the *Pictorial Biography of St Pius X* and it is even more splendidly successful, thanks to the magical beauty of the Umbrian landscapes. That superb photographer, L. von Matt, has here assembled two hundred marvellous plates illustrating every place and every thing that came into the life of St Francis. Here we have it all from San Francesco Piccolo, from the font where he and St Clare were baptized, to the Cliff of the Stigmata and the Tomb in the crypt of the Basilica. Of Assisi itself there are no fewer than one hundred and thirty views. The whole area is covered, Gubbio, Rivo Torto, Foligno, Trevi, Spoleto, Todi, La Foresta, Greccio, La Verna and more, in fact everything from Venice and Verona to Rome and Subiaco.

With all this wealth and beauty of topographical illustration it should be clearly understood that the book follows closely in the steps of St Francis. We have here the famous crucifix of San Damiano, the wonderful Romanesque Madonna at San Casale, the Porziuncola, the Carceri, Calle di Cortona; we can look closely at

the Saint's habit, a sandal, a deacon's alb worn by him, a chalice and paten used by him as deacon at Mass and a piece of chamois leather that covered the wound in his side. We can see the Bull of Honorius III authorizing the Rule, the autographs of two letters of the Saint; the lake of Piediluco, the Tiber at Baschi where he preached to the fishes; the house of Bernard of Quintavalle and that of Angelo di Tancredi. The group of portraits comprise the most ancient likeness, that of the Sacro Speco at Subiaco; that which is attributed to Cimabue, on the sarcophagus; the Berlinghieri portrait of 1260; and, from the Lower Church at Assisi, the other "Cimabue", and on the dust-cover the portrait formerly attributed to Simone Martini but now given to Donato of Siena.

The Saint's brethren of today are by no means forgotten in this comprehensive record. One very pleasing group of plates shows the Friars Minor at Santa Maria degli Angeli (the Porziuncola); another, the Conventuals in the cloister at San Francesco, Assisi; Brother Leonard with his turtle doves at Fonte Colombo; Capuchins at Calle di Cortona; and a very genial elderly friar at La Verna, saddling his mule for "the quest"; and these are by no means all.

Father Hauser's text, sensitively rendered by Father Bullough, contains much that is informative: a list of the places chosen for the early foundations, Thomas of Celano's description of the Saint, a translation of the *Canticle of the Sun*, Dante's lines on Assisi—Par. XI, 49–54, and statistics of the whole Franciscan Order. Appended are two good, clear maps, an index of the plates, a list of references (many of them to the *Life* by the late Father Cuthbert), a short bibliography and epilogues by the two collaborators. This magnificent volume, which should be used in conjunction with Edward Hutton's *Assisi and Umbria Revisited* (THE CLERGY REVIEW, Feb. 1954), is indeed a memorable tribute to the Poverello whom even Mussolini called *il più santo dei Santi*.

St Pius X: A Pictorial Biography. By Leonard von Matt and Nello Vian. Translated from the German by Sebastian Bullough, O.P. (Longmans. 30s.)

THIS royal octavo volume has no fewer than one hundred and fifty splendid photographs (full-page, or double-page) depicting every possible incident and aspect of the life of St Pius X, interleaved with explanatory matter in itself biographical and with a number of short chapters relating everything pertaining to his personal habits and experiences. The photographs are the result of prolonged investigation by Herr von Matt in every place where the Saint lived and in the museums, archives and private collections of memorials. The

biographical essays by Signor Vian are the work of a Venetian whose father was a personal friend of the Pope. There is everything here: Riese, where he was born, Castelfranco where he was at school, the seminary of Padua; Tombolo where he was a curate; Salzano, Treviso; Mantua, where he was the bishop, and so on to his tomb in St Peter's and the tremendous spectacle of the canonization. Nor are they conventional views. At Venice we see him stepping into a gondola alongside the Scalzi to be taken to St Mark's for enthronement, and similarly departing for the conclave. Very interesting is the episcopal consecration of Mgr Della Chiesa who was to be his successor within seven years, and also the famous consecration of fourteen French bishops together, in St Peter's on the 2 February 1906. This remarkable scene is, however, wrongly dated in the text (p. 58), as 24 May 1914, when in fact the Red Hat was bestowed upon a large group of cardinals. Another unexpected item is the scene on 24 June 1914: Mḡri Eugenio Pacelli and Nicola Canali are standing behind Cardinal Merry del Val who has just signed a Concordat with Serbia.

Expedicio Billarum Antiquitus: An Unpublished Chapter of the Second Book of The Manner of Holding Parliaments in England. By Henry Elyngue, Clerk of the Parliaments. Edited by Catherine Strateman Sims. (Publications Universitaires de Louvain. In paper boards. \$2.90.)

WITH the aid of a grant from U.N.E.S.C.O., the Associate Professor of History at Agnes Scott College has edited this No. XVI of the Studies presented to the International Commission for the History of Representative and Parliamentary Institutions. The tractate *Expedicio*, etc., was to have been the fifth chapter of the second volume of Elyngue's *The Manner of Holding Parliaments in England* and it was so identified by Mrs Sims in 1937. Elyngue apparently planned "a Seconde booke" in twelve chapters, first of all, but then reduced his list of contents to eight and then, later on, wrote in the margin "begunn but god knowes when I shall finish this booke. Sept. 1625". He was clerk of the parliaments under James I and Charles I and his object, as explained in a brief but lucid preface by Dr Helen Cam, was to correct the present-day practice of his time with the mediaeval precedents and so furnish a guide to contemporary politicians. Things would thus be kept on a sound basis, for scholars and antiquary as he was, Elyngue had already noticed that the Commons had begun to innovate. He explains all sorts of things, e.g. the difference between the King's answer given to petitions in the Lords, which might be debated, and the formal royal assent, which was

final. Originally the royal refusal was given in direct negative words though in "a fayre language". The dilatory formula "*Le roi s'avisera*" was adopted in the time of Edward III. That monarch, says Elsyng, "being continually in warre, very seldom thought of petitions soe referred unto him or His Councell had noe leisure or at least noe will to advise Him thereon. And so in tyme *s'avisera* became as bad as the King's denyall . . . which continues to this day".

The tractate is admirably produced and edited with a full Introduction and index.

J. J. D.

John Henry Newman: The Concept of Infallible Doctrinal Authority.
(A Doctorate Dissertation.) Rev. Romuald A. Dibble, S.D.S.,
S.T.L. (Catholic University, 1955. \$3.50)

DR DIBBLE has taken as his subject Newman's development of thought with regard to the Church's doctrinal authority. He traces Newman's early Anglican views through the gradual stages that led him to accept the doctrine of an infallible Church. He then deals with the paradoxical situation that developed when the same Newman, who was a lifelong opponent of rationalism, who became a Catholic when he saw the essential connexion between infallibility and a living divine Church, yet became in his Catholic life a defender of true freedom of scientific investigation and an opponent of the definition of 1870. Dr Dibble shows clearly that there is really no fundamental opposition between these attitudes. When, in his early Anglican life, Newman opposed Roman Infallibility, he was influenced by his then view of the historical facts. These facts were at first understood by him to imply that Christ's promise of visible unity for His Church had been forfeited since the early centuries through man's unfaithfulness. Visible unity having gone, it seemed to Newman that many of the other promises to the Church must have been forfeited with it, including that of visible guidance in the truth. The universal teaching of the Catholic Church, while it was still undivided, he held, must be the original *depositum fidei*. So the criterion of ancient consent was still important. But since what, as an Anglican, he regarded as the break-up of Church unity, the doctrine of any one branch, including that of Rome, could only be an opinion.

Gradually his view of the facts changed. He came to reject his earlier view that the Church had been divided. Gradually he came to see that Christ's solemn promises of unity and divine guidance had not failed, and could not fail. So infallibility came to be inseparable from the true Church's possession of the deposit of sound

doctrine. At the same time, other earlier difficulties were gradually removed by his acceptance of the principle of doctrinal development, a principle he saw anticipated analogically in Judaism.

In this way, Newman's first period of opposition to rationalism took the form of an acceptance of the full doctrinal authority of Christ's Church. During his Catholic life his attack on rationalism took more the form of a defence of the true Christian life within the Church. Having accepted and defended the Church's infallible authority, he was now concerned to show that such authority was in full harmony with the utmost true freedom of scientific and historical scholarship. He did not fear the advance of science. But he did fear that some Church leaders might do harm to the cause of the Church by an imprecise appeal to authority in matters that did not come within her doctrinal competence. He was afraid that some of the defenders of the definition of 1870 were carried away by their enthusiasm into an irresponsible attitude. History surely proves that he was right in this appraisal of the personal situation. It has often been pointed out that Newman, humanly speaking, had an important influence on the eventual restrained terms of the actual definition. Dr Dibble shows most clearly how baseless is the view, once superficially held by some, that Newman feared the doctrine of infallibility. He feared above all the possible terms in which it might be defined.

Dr Dibble's study is vitally important for the study of Newman's attitude to the grave nineteenth-century clash between authority and rationalism. It is also important to help all who realize the importance of defending true divine authority, without sacrificing true liberty of scientific and historical research. The harmony that exists today between Catholic scholarship and the Church shows that Newman's struggle has not been in vain.

H. F. D.

Shane Leslie's Ghost Book. Pp. xii + 160. (Hollis & Carter. 12s. 6d.)

The author quotes in his introduction the remark of an English statesman "that there is nothing in political life which can be compared to the interest and profound significance of psychical research". The nature of this interest varies. For many, probably for at least half, of those who give themselves to this line of enquiry, their purpose is to find empirical demonstration of a future life. Others, antecedently convinced of such a life on philosophical ground, seek a rational explanation of various types of alleged para-normal phenomena. Still others most likely are animated by a desire to discredit the supernatural.

Many are interested in telling ghost stories, but among English Catholics at least very few take a serious interest in psychical research. Sir Shane Leslie shows an interest in this question which goes beyond the mere idle recitation of stories of uncanny occurrences. What seems more than anything else to have moved him to take up his pen is to refute the belief, which he says is widespread, that Catholics are not allowed to believe in ghosts. So expressed the problem is not very happily stated. What is a ghost? In common parlance a ghost is the spirit of a deceased human being which in some way we do not understand has become visible to a few at least of those on earth. Every spirit is not therefore a ghost; nor even is every human spirit one. But the majority of so-called ghosts are probably hallucinations even if many of them are telepathically caused ones. Now, of course, Catholics believe in apparitions both of angels and in certain cases of deceased human beings. But this is not what the average man means by believing in ghosts. He means rather that the spirits of the dead roam capriciously about the world to which they no more belong.

Is there a Catholic Spiritualism? How much of popular ghostlore is compatible with the Catholic faith? Such were the problems which confronted the author. He admits that Catholics are forbidden to evoke the spirits of the dead, though he quotes Sir Oliver Lodge as saying that some Catholics manage to "square their priests" and go to seances. He seems to incline to the view that manifestations from the spirit world unsought by those on this side are of common occurrence.

Among such so-called poltergeist phenomena naturally play a prominent part. The explanations of them which have been offered are legion. Southey attributed the disturbances in the Wesley household to "a contagious nervous disease". The Hinton Ampner ones were ascribed to smugglers; the Worksop ones to electricity. More recently it has been suggested that they are due to underground rivers changing their course. But most popular is the theory which puts them down to the pranks of naughty children. Sir Shane looks with favour on the view that they are caused by souls in Purgatory demanding prayers, though he thinks sometimes they may be due to elemental spirits, neither good angels nor devils. Occasionally however there may be actual diabolic activity. Catholic ghost stories conform to certain well-defined types. There is the soul from purgatory asking for prayers; there is the priest demanding the saying of Masses which have been left unsaid. A group centres round the procuring by supernormal means of the Last Sacraments for those in need of them. There is the Catholic who with an uneasy con-

science is conforming to Protestant worship and the priest who returns to earth to procure the destruction of a document; there are ghostly readers and listeners (generally children) to ghostly music; while the death compact appears in many shapes.

The conditions for a critical survey of the whole of Sir Shane Leslie's collection no longer exist but certain criticisms may be hazarded. Abbot Hunter-Blair's story of the ghost of Cleve Hall raises in the mind the possibility that it is a combination of two originally distinct stories. Even the well known Oratory ghost-story contains room for a subjective element. The story of the Italian ghost who remains on earth to carry out an act of vengeance is untheological. So too is Sir Shane's suggestion that the Witch of Endor had power to compel the spirit of Samuel to appear. There is however an interesting piece of corroboration of his story of children sleeping in a haunted house who thought that mice were running over their faces. For two hundred years ago Eliza Parsons, the medium in the story of the Cock Lane ghost, felt the spirit like a mouse on her back. Considering that this book expounds Catholic teaching on the Occult its usefulness might have been enhanced by an imprimatur.

HUMPHREY J. T. JOHNSON

The Canon of the Mass. A New Translation. By Dom Placid Murray, O.S.B. (Reprinted from *The Furrow*. 4d.)

FIVE years ago an article appeared in this REVIEW, pleading for a lot more experimental work by translators. "Let us have the Mass and the other essential rites and the liturgical prayers in commonest use translated by a number of different hands: a series of draft versions, each going one better than the last." Since that was written, Monsignor Knox has published his translation of the Ordo and Canon; and now a monk of Glenstal Priory, Dom Placid Murray, offers a new version of the Canon alone. This owes nothing at all to previous English translations. Apart from an occasional roughness of style (e.g. "for you and for many for the remission of sins", and "this partaking of thy altar"), it is carefully wrought. Its greatest merit is that it takes due account of recent exegetical work by Mohrmann, Botte, Jungmann, and other liturgiologists. There is only one obvious mistranslation: "not questioning our merits", for *non aestimator meriti*; it should be "not weighing . . ." To "look down on" something means to scorn it, and consequently does not translate *respicere*. Is "guardians" dynamic enough for *cultoribus*? And why does Dom Placid render *sacrificia* in the *Te igitur* by "sacrifices", when he has himself pointed out on an earlier page that it is synony-

mous with *dona*? For *muniamur* (in *Te igitur*), *jubeas* (in *Hanc igitur*), and *familis* (in *Nobis quoque*), no English equivalents are offered; nor does it compensate us for these omissions to find that Dom Placid has needlessly interpolated ten vocative O's.

H. P. R. FINBERG

La Femme dans l'Eglise. By F. X. Arnold. Pp. 143. (Les Editions Ouvrières. 330 frs. français.)

THIS is a translation from the German text of the Rector of the University of Tübingen and deals with a subject which is gradually attracting more attention. It casts doubts on whether the feminists have gained the right things; it suggests that in demanding equality as a human person woman has neglected, or has been deprived of the opportunity of making, her own specific feminine contribution to the world. The first two chapters dealing with the double polarity of creation and the complementary nature of woman are admirably succinct and complete and lead one to expect some original thought in the chapter dealing with woman in the Church. But these expectations are disappointed. There is no profound consideration of the single woman, although the problem is mentioned, and the author (writing in 1948) was not able to benefit by the Holy Father's encyclical on virginity. The fourth and last chapter is an interesting essay on the married state, with particular reference to the decree of the Holy Office of 29 March 1944, but lays no particular stress on the feminine contribution. It is perhaps inevitable that the numerous references should be almost all to German works, but where French translations are available (for example *Die ewige Frau* of Gertrude Von Le Fort was published by the *Editions du Cerf* in 1946) they should be cited.

Maladjusted Children. By Charles L. C. Burns, M.R.C.S., F.B., Ps.S., etc. Pp. x + 81. (Hollis & Carter. 6s.)

THIS book is a model of its kind. Its author, the Senior Psychiatrist to the Birmingham Child Guidance Service, writes out of his more than twenty years of practical experience in dealing with maladjusted, nervous and delinquent children. He writes clearly and judiciously, avoids jargon, and makes his points by short case-histories. While accepting the findings of modern psychology he shows how they are far from removing the idea of moral responsibility, and indeed he stresses this point because he realizes that modern psychology and its application meet with less understanding and acceptance among Catholics than others. This is not a long book, but to parents, teachers, religious and priests it is worth more

than many tomes five times its size. After reading it one can understand and endorse the recommendation of the Committee on Maladjusted Children, in its recently published report, that every local education authority should have a comprehensive child guidance service.

J. F.

Saints and Ourselves. Personal Studies. Edited by Philip Caraman, S.J. Pp. 140. (Hollis & Carter. 10s. 6d.)

IN 1952 *The Month* published a series of twelve lives of saints by twelve distinguished authors. They are collected in the present volume. Each writer chose his or her own subject. It is interesting to see that the choices range through the Christian era from St Helena (by Mr Evelyn Waugh) to St Maria Goretti (by Dr E. B. Strauss). Four Doctors of the Church are included, two founders of religious orders, and two mystics. The only English Saint is St Thomas More (by Sir Henry Slesser). It is a book to be widely recommended.

The Last of the Fathers. By Thomas Merton. Pp. 123. (Hollis & Carter. 10s. 6d.)

FATHER MERTON gives us in this book a conspectus of the life and writings of St Bernard, and a translation, with notes under a separate heading, of the Encyclical, *Doctor Mellifluus*, which the Holy Father issued in 1953 to commemorate the eighth centenary of the death of St Bernard. The writer's chief aim is to make the Encyclical widely known; the biographical section of the book is merely a *hors-d'œuvre*; it will stimulate the appetite to take a full course of reading on St Bernard, the greatest man of his century and one of the greatest of spiritual writers. Although not in the first rank of Father Merton's books, it displays all the qualities which have made his world-wide reputation. But he still needs a little broadening of mind, to include Everyman among the candidates for sanctity.

J. C.

CORRESPONDENCE

CIRCUMDATA VARIETATE

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1956, XLI, p. 88)

The Right Rev. Abbot Adrian Taylor, O.S.B., writes:

Father Coyne's article on ecclesiastical lace reminds one of an experience related to the writer by the late Dr Adrian Fortescue.

While preparing to deliver the first of a series of sermons at Westminster Cathedral, Dr Fortescue was handed a lace-trimmed surplice very suggestive of an article of ladies' underwear. He handed it back to the sacristan with the words, "Please give me something which I can wear without a blush." This reply of the great liturgist and humorist would suggest that lace-trimmed garments for priests may offend not only against *sobrietas* and *austeritas* (to use the words of Pius XII) but also against *pudor*.

ORGANIST AT DIVINE OFFICE

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1956, XLI, p. 168)

Dom A. Gregory Murray, O.S.B., writes:

As one who has for well over thirty years functioned as organist at liturgical services, I must confess my surprise that anyone should have any doubt as to whether acting in that capacity satisfies the obligation of the Divine Office. Surely common sense gives a clearly affirmative answer. The scrupulous suggestion that perhaps the organist should join in the singing, at least of one side of the choir, is likely to lead to unfortunate results, for no one can give his full attention to the accompaniment of other singers (especially if they are at a distance) if he is singing himself. I have known organists who tried to do this: they were thoroughly bad accompanists. It should be obvious, it seems to me, that the organist at a liturgical function (like any other official) should give his whole attention to his job, so that it may be performed as well as possible. If he does that, who is to say that he does not satisfy his obligation to participate in the Divine Office?

CONFITEOR ON GOOD FRIDAY

CORRECTION

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1956, XLI, p. 136)

Line 18: for "but no" read "and the"

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

t-
r-
d
g
st
sts
ds

ist
ld
he
rly
he
, is
full
ney
ists
It
cal
to
oes
ici-